

# Moving to Our Future:

## Pricing Options for **Equitable Mobility**



**PBOT**  
PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION



## Community Task Force Meeting #13 – Meeting Summary

March 8, 2021 | 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Virtual Meeting

### Relevant Materials

Please find links to relevant meeting materials below:

- [Meeting 13 Agenda](#)
- [Meeting 13 Recording](#)
- [Meeting 13 Presentation Slides](#)
- [Draft tolling recommendation letter](#) (distributed pre-meeting)
- [Final tolling recommendation letter](#) (adopted at the meeting)
- [Equitable Mobility Framework \(working draft\)](#)
- [Pricing Options for Equitable Mobility Website](#)

### Agenda

TIME	AGENDA ITEM
6:00 p.m.	<b>Welcome &amp; Housekeeping</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agenda review</li><li>• Finalize <a href="#">Meeting #12 Summary</a></li><li>• Public comment</li></ul>
6:10 p.m.	<b>Phase 4 Overview:</b> Path to Recommendations
6:25 p.m.	<b>Presentation &amp; Discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Metro Regional Congestion Pricing Study (RCPS)</li></ul>
7:25 p.m.	<b>Tolling Recommendations</b>
7:50 p.m.	<b>Next Steps &amp; Wrap-Up</b>

## Attendance

Present:

<b>Task Force Members</b>		<b>City Staff</b>	<b>Bureau</b>
Violeta Alvarez	Tony Jordan	Catherine Ciarlo	Transportation
Andy Cotugno	Ady Leverette	Shoshana Cohen	Transportation
Baofeng "Bao" Dong	Esme Miller	Michael Espinoza	Transportation
Taren Evans	Elizabeth Liedel Turnbull	Ingrid Fish	BPS
Monique Gaskins	Tammy Lundervold	Eric Hesse	Transportation
Aaron Grimmer	Sherifa Roach	Peter Hurley	Transportation
Hau Hagedorn	Ashton Simpson	Mel Krnjaić	Transportation
Justin Jackson	Sara Wright	Marianna Lomanto	Transportation
		Art Pearce	Transportation
		Emma Sagor	Transportation
		Marty Stockton	BPS

### **Project Advisors**

Vivian Satterfield	Kevin O'Neil
--------------------	--------------

### **Guest Presenters**

Matt Bihn	Alex Oreschak
-----------	---------------

Absent:

### **Task Force Members**

Stephenie Frederick	Shani Harris-Bagwell	Jonathan Hutchison
---------------------	----------------------	--------------------

## Welcome & Housekeeping

*Emma Sagor, Facilitator, welcomed Task Force members and informed attendees that the meeting will be recorded to ensure Task Force members and those unable to attend will have access.*

## Public Comment

The City will be collecting public comment throughout the entire 18-month Task Force process via email, regular mail, phone, and written and verbal comments at public events. At each meeting, Task Force members will be provided a written report of public comments received since the last meeting.

To share comments with the Pricing for Equitable Mobility Task Force, please email comments and questions to [POEMComments@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:POEMComments@portlandoregon.gov). All comments received via email by the Friday before a Task Force meeting (which occur the second Monday of each month) will be recorded and shared with the Task Force at the meeting.

No public comments were received prior to Meeting #13. No verbal public comments were shared during the meeting.

## Phase 4 Update: Path to Recommendations

*Shoshana Cohen provided an overview of the Task Force's path and timeline to develop final recommendations.*

This meeting marks the beginning of Phase 4 of the Task Force's work. In this phase, the Task Force will review further analysis across all pricing typologies introduced to date to help refine recommendations.

### Phase 4: Meeting Plan & Topics

#### **Meeting #14** | March 8, 2021

- Where the Task Force work stands and where the work is going
- Vote on early tolling recommendations
- Presentation on Metro Regional Congestion Pricing Study (RCPS) results

#### **Meeting #15** | April 12, 2021

- Further consideration of policy design trade-offs using "pricing Sandbox" tool

#### **Meeting #16** | May 10, 2021

- Complementary strategies

- Electrification and fuel shifting
- Transit
- Incentives and programs
- Implementation considerations

June & July 2021

- Finalize Task Force recommendations

## Recommendation Types

*Shoshana provided an overview of the types of recommendations the group will likely produce at the end of their 18-month process. She also noted where the Task Force is now in terms of formulating these recommendations and how the group will continue to refine this thinking in throughout the final set of meetings.*

### 1. Principles for Pricing for Equitable Mobility

Overarching recommendations for how the City should consider and design new pricing strategies moving forward.

- **Where are we now:** Key themes captured through Task Force discussions to date:
  - Pricing holds promise for helping to advance transportation climate and equity outcomes
  - Pricing system should prioritize demand management
  - Center climate & equity goals throughout design and prioritize outcomes
  - Revenue use matters. Reinvest in multimodal alternatives
  - Provide discounts/rebates/exemptions for low-income drivers
  - Design to reduce unequal burdens of technology and enforcement
- **Moving Forward**
  - Further consider and refine based on information shared in March, April, May 2021
  - Final refinement/voting in June and July 2021

### 2. Nearer-Term Pricing Moves

Recommendations of pricing ideas to prioritize for further development within a near-term timeframe (i.e., in the next few years)

- **Where we are now:**
  - POEM project staff have been consulting the POEM technical advisory committee (TAC) to help focus which actions may be most feasible for nearer-term implementation if the Task Force chooses to recommend them. Most of the potential nearer-term ideas generated today have been related to parking and commercial services.
  - The most feasible nearer-term ideas discussed by the group to-date include:

- **Parking**
      - Parking cash-out
      - Fees on private parking lots
      - Making it easier to add priced parking areas in the City
    - **Commercial Services**
      - New demand- or impact-based fees on private-for-hire trips (TNCs) and/or urban delivery vehicles
  - Based on the TAC's input, the project team recommends focusing in on these ideas for further deliberation and discussion. A few additional ideas originally discussed last summer, including Smart Park/meter adjustments and unbundling, will continue to be explored through other existing and ongoing processes.
- **Moving Forward**
    - Revisit nearer-term ideas in June 2021
      - Further consider based on information shared in March, April, May 2021
    - Final refinement/voting in June and July 2021
    - All recommendations will require further analysis and policy development work

### 3. Longer-Term Pricing Opportunities

Recommendations around which longer-term pricing policies show the most promise for the City to further consider.

- **Where we are now:**
  - **Longer-term pricing strategies discussed:**
    - Dynamic on-street parking
    - Cordons
    - Road usage charges (RUC)
  - **Tolling is unique:**
    - Medium-term implementation timeline
      - (not quite short- or long-term implementation category)
    - Moving forward now via state processes; opportunity for the City to influence the process as a stakeholder, but not the primary decision maker or implementer
- **Moving Forward**
  - Continue exploring March- May 2021:
    - Which options seem most promising
    - Important design/implementation considerations
    - Complementary strategies
  - Final refinement/voting in June and July 2021

### 4. Complementary Strategies to Further Explore Alongside Pricing

Strategies that are critical in addition to pricing to ensure equitable mobility (as parallel investments or reinvestment opportunities)

- **Complementary strategies discussed so far:**
  - Transit infrastructure/service
  - Bike and pedestrian infrastructure/services
  - Incentives and financial support for different travel options
  - Strategies to incentivize shift to electric and more fuel-efficient vehicles
  - Affordable housing
  - Land use policy
- **Moving Forward**
  - May Task Force Meeting #15 will focus on some of these complimentary strategies
    - Plan to provide additional information on complimentary strategies
  - Will not be able to dive deep into all topics, recommendations will be high level
  - Final refinement and voting in June/July 2021

## 5. Implementation Considerations & Approaches

Recommendations of future process steps and implementation considerations

- **Where we are now:**
  - Task Force has only briefly touched on topic of implementation. Things to discuss:
    - COVID-19 impacts
    - Coalition building, communications, & political strategy
    - Community engagement
    - Sequencing of different ideas
    - Technology needs
- **Moving Forward**
  - Continue to consider implementation as we move through the next few months
  - Focused discussion in May Task Force Meeting #15
  - Final refinement and voting in June/July 2021

### Task Force Q&A

- **Timeframes:** Task Force members asked how we are defining nearer- and longer-term actions:
  - Staff noted this is a spectrum and there's no hard definition. In general, all actions will require more process and development before implementation. Nearer-term actions generally are things the City could potentially implement in a few years time, while longer-term actions will likely take longer as they will definitely require interjurisdictional coordination.

## Presentation: Metro Regional Congestion Pricing Study

*Shoshana Cohen offered some background and context on Metro's Regional Congestion Pricing Study (RCPS).*

## Background & Context

- Metro recently completed a modeling exercise to study many of the same pricing strategies the Task Force has been considering.
- Invited Metro to present their draft RCPS results at this meeting to:
  - Help inform POEM Task Force discussions
  - Consider how results align with internal discussions to date and whether they help validate or raise new questions about expected trends and dynamics
  - Highlight important considerations for further policy design analysis and exploration
- Models have limitations
  - All models provide modeled (not real) information and cannot provide absolute answers
  - Further analysis is required to understand impacts (both positive and negative) more fully
  - Metro did not look at impacts of certain design parameters, such as low-income exemptions or variable-rate pricing, in its analysis
- In April/May, will further discuss design and complementary strategies
  - Will not get to absolute answers through this process

*Shoshana Cohen introduced guest presenters from Metro, Alex Oreschak and Matt Binh, to provide an overview of Metro's work on the Regional Congestion Pricing Study (RCPS).*

*The full contents of Metro's RCPS presentation can be viewed in the [meeting slides](#). This summary includes the key take-aways and highlights from the Task Force discussion about the presentation.*

## Goal of Regional Congestion Pricing Study

- To understand how the Portland region could use congestion pricing to manage traffic demand to meet climate goals without adversely impacting, and potentially improving, safety and equity.  
*\*\*\*Metro is not recommending or implementing any pricing measures through the RCPS\*\*\**

## Scenario Assessment- Caveats

- Scenarios tested provide a general assessment of how congestion pricing could perform with our land use and transportation system
- Scenarios are NOT iterative. They demonstrate model results **without** adjustments to address issues that arise around the scenario
- Scenarios do NOT assume multiple pricing projects.
- Actual projects would take the next step to explore:
  - Design changes to improve benefits and reduce impacts
  - Targeting revenues to improve performance (safety, equity, congestion, climate)
  - Discounts for key groups

### Summary of Scenarios

- 8 scenarios
- Charges assessed within MPA boundaries only (in \$2010)
- Compare effects of different types of charges and amount charged

### Assumptions for each scenario

- All assume higher vehicle costs than current

VMT B	VMT C	COR A	COR B
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charge per mile driven</li> <li>• \$0.2795/mile vehicle operating cost</li> <li>• \$0.0685/mile charge over base</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher charge per mile driven</li> <li>• \$0.343/mile vehicle operating cost</li> <li>• \$0.132/mile charge over base</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drivers charged \$5.63 to enter cordon area</li> <li>• Higher end of price range based on other cities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drivers charged \$5.63 to enter cordon area</li> <li>• Larger cordon area than COR A (Central East side &amp; Lloyd District)</li> </ul>
PARK A	PARK B	Roadway A (RD A)	Roadway B (RD B)
Higher charges to park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking assumptions from 2040 FC Scenario</li> </ul>	Much higher charges to park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doubles the parking assumptions from 2040 FC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toll on highways</li> <li>• Equivalent to VMT C per-mile charge</li> <li>• \$0.132/mile</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher toll on highways</li> <li>• Double the cost of RD A</li> <li>• \$0.264/mile</li> </ul>
<b>Base Scenario Charge: \$0.211/mile vehicle operating cost</b>			

### High-Level DRAFT Findings from Modeling

- All four scenario types help address climate and congestion priorities.
- All eight scenarios reduce the drive alone rate, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions, while increasing daily transit trips.



- Geographic distributions of benefits and costs vary by scenario.
- There are tradeoffs for implementing pricing scenarios.
- VMT & Parking scenarios show the most positive changes, no negative changes
- Cordon & Roadway scenarios see some increases in delay and reductions in job access
- These results are before any discounts/exemptions, reinvestment of revenues, or iterations of program design

RTP Goal	Metrics	VMT B	VMT C	COR A	COR B	PARK A	PARK B	RD A	RD B
<b>Congestion &amp; Climate</b>	Daily VMT	Large Positive Change	Large Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Large Positive Change
	Drive Alone Rate	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Minimal Change	Small Positive Change
	Daily Transit Trips	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Large Positive Change	Minimal Change	Small Positive Change
	2HR Freeway Delay	Large Positive Change	Large Positive Change	Moderate Negative Change	Moderate Negative Change	Moderate Positive Change	Large Positive Change	Large Positive Change	Large Positive Change
	2HR Arterial Delay	Large Positive Change	Large Positive Change	Moderate Negative Change	Moderate Negative Change	Moderate Positive Change	Large Positive Change	Moderate Negative Change	Moderate Negative Change
<b>Climate</b>	<b>Emissions</b>	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Small Positive Change
<b>Equity</b>	<b>Job Access (Auto)</b>	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Moderate Negative Change	Moderate Negative Change	Small Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change
	<b>Job Access (Transit)</b>	Small Positive Change	Moderate Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Small Positive Change	Minimal Change	Small Positive Change	Minimal Change	Moderate Negative Change
<b>Total Regional Travel Cost</b>		Med-High	High	Med-Low	Med-Low	Low	Low	Med	Med

Large Positive Change
Moderate Positive Change
Small Positive Change
Minimal Change
Small Negative Change
Moderate Negative Change
Large Negative Change

### Equity Considerations

- **How pricing programs can be designed to improve equity?**
  - Affordability can be built into a program
    - More flexible than current funding sources. Can provide discounts or exemptions for key groups.
  - Revenue can be focused on equity outcomes
    - Invest in key neighborhoods
    - Focus on transit, sidewalks, bike lanes
    - Invest in senior and disabled services
  - Targeting pricing benefits to key locations

- Mobility improvements and air quality
- **How can we measure equity impacts?**
  - Access to Jobs
    - Model can show how access to jobs changes with different pricing strategies
  - Impacts for all compared to key areas (Equity Focus Areas and others)- zones with higher concentrations of affected populations
    - Travel time, costs, mode shift, congestion
    - Use new tools to measure impacts related to emissions, noise, pollution

## Schedule & Next Steps

- Next Steps
  - Expert review (Feb – April 2021)
  - Prepare draft and final report (Feb – June 2021)
- Key Dates
  - Metro Council and JPACT – April 15
  - Expert Review Panel – April 22
  - TPAC, JPACT, MPAC and Metro Council – June 2021
  - Final Report – June 2021
- Contact
  - Project Manager: [Elizabeth.Mros-OHara@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:Elizabeth.Mros-OHara@oregonmetro.gov)

## POEM Team Takeaways

*Ingrid Fish shared some key takeaways identified by the POEM Strategy Team when they first reviewed these results.*

- The results of the RCPS reinforce much of what the Task Force has discussed to date. Overall, they suggest that pricing could help manage congestion, reduce VMT and lead to climate/air quality benefits over the status quo
- The modeling suggests there is no one panacea solution. While all scenarios show some benefits, some show some trade-offs, and we'll need to explore what complementary strategies are critical for addressing those trade-offs.
- The VMT/road usage charge scenarios and the parking scenarios stood out for the relatively low indication of negative impacts and greater VMT reduction potential.
- Equity
  - Would be helpful to understand who is bearing the burden of pricing scenarios
  - Modeling of exemptions and other design parameters will be an important next step for better understanding equity implications
  - Scenarios will increase transportation costs for some. We'd want to model the effects of providing discounts/exemptions to low-income drivers
- We'd want to look deeper at:

- Whether variable time-of-day prices would lessen those impacts
- Whether combining pricing strategies could lessen those impacts
- Whether different geographic design (i.e. cordon boundaries) could change impacts
- Whether further investment in complementary multimodal options could lessen those impacts
- Whether strategies that take into account fuel efficiency/emissions help with climate outcomes

## Task Force Discussion and Q&A

- **Value of Model Outputs:** Task Force members commented on the value of looking at tangible scenarios to see the impact of different pricing strategies. They also appreciated that the model illustrated potential trade-offs and impacts, such as traffic diversion.
- **Safety Analysis in Regional Congestion Pricing Study (RCPS):** Task Force members noted that the RCPS analysis framework listed safety as one of the region's priorities that each pricing strategy would be measured against and asked if and how the Metro team considered this.
  - **Metro Response:** Metro staff noted the complexity of modeling safety outputs and because of the many factors involved in roadway safety (VMT, speed, diversion, etc.) and therefore were unable to draw conclusions at this stage about safety implications of these modeled scenarios. They noted safety is also an important consideration of revenue reinvestment, particularly related to how you manage and plan for possible diversion onto local roads.
- **Data on Who is Driving Downtown & Who is Paying to Park:** Task Force members noted the importance of having better data around the demographics of who is driving downtown and who is paying to park to better understand who might be required to pay higher prices under various pricing strategies.
  - **PBOT Response:** Staff recognized that this was one of the first questions from the Task Force. While early on there were hopes to do some surveying during the POEM project to begin gathering this data, the COVID pandemic complicated that effort since this is likely not a representative time for surveying. While we will not get data before the POEM Task Force process adjourns, this remains a high priority for future policy development and refinement work. Staff also noted that the Task Force has the option as part of the recommendation process to suggest that the city collect the data necessary to answer those questions and do so in an ongoing way.
- **Implementation Timeline:** Task Force members noted the results suggest promising outcomes from a VMT-based fee/road usage charge. They asked when this could realistically be implemented.
  - Staff noted Oregon is in the lead in the nation for piloting road usage charging technology and that pilots are ongoing to continue testing the feasibility of this.

Implementation timelines are not certain, but current legislation under consideration by the State legislature could make enrollment in the road usage charging program mandatory for high-efficiency vehicles (at least 30 mpg) by 2027.

Task Force members also noted the importance of discussing timeframes when talking about COVID and the variable travel and traffic conditions associated with the pandemic. Task Force members suggested delineating a length of time for piloting policies.

- **Parking Pricing:** Task Force members noted the positive impact of the parking pricing scenarios and the opportunity this could present since transportation agencies already use this strategy today. Task Force members noted that parking strategies generally involve fewer people paying higher fees (in areas that usually have alternative travel options, like transit) whereas a road usage charge would involve a smaller cost spread among more people, with those paying most often those who live furthest from transit.
- **Telework Trends:** Task Force members inquired around the future of telework in the wake of COVID and whether Metro and PBOT are thinking about and/or modeling this.
  - PBOT staff said they are actively thinking about the policy implications of these trends and monitoring the data. We have seen a rebound in traffic congestion and VMT even while many people continue to work from home. Staff also recognized the shortage of data, with the last major survey being undertaken in 2010, and the infrequency of large surveys given they are a major endeavor. Staff acknowledged that there is likely to be a “new normal” but that level still remains unknown.
- **Additional RCPS Examples:** Task Force members asked for the Metro modeling team to provide more examples of transit time savings to better understand equity implications.
  - Metro provided the following additional examples after the meeting: [https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2021/metrocps\\_additional-cost-slides\\_030921.pdf](https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2021/metrocps_additional-cost-slides_030921.pdf)
- **Desire for further analysis of variable rates and discounts/exemptions:** Task Force members expressed a desire to see further analysis of variable pricing models, where the charge changes based on conditions or time of day, as well as discounts/exemptions for certain groups, particularly low-income drivers. A Task Force member also noted that they are less concerned about providing discounts/exemptions for fuel efficient and electric vehicles, given the private market will also be encouraging fuel shifting by increasing supply/incentives.

## Tolling Recommendations

*Emma Sagor presented the [draft Task Force tolling recommendation letter](#), distributed the to the group in advance of the meeting. Task Force members had the opportunity to share proposed edits: content changes were shown in red line in the draft letter, while grammatical improvements were underlined in black.*

Five Task Force members submitted comments and edits:

- **Overarching suggestions included:**

- Use active voice and simpler language
  - Proposed grammatical edits to make the language clearer, less bureaucratic and more direct
- Consider Constitutional Restriction recommendation on its own
- Call these "objectives" not "values"
- Consider not listing multiple equity groups when pricing most burdens low-income people
  - Did not make this change because of other comments heard from Task Force members about the importance of being specific about who is impacted by different policy components and factors.

*Emma walked through the three primary recommendation sections of the letter. She summarized the key points, highlighted the proposed changes submitted prior to the meeting, and then invited further discussion and recommendations for edits from the group.*

### **Section 1: Tolling Goal**

- Key points in the draft letter:
  - The primary goal should be to managing traffic demand to improve mobility and climate outcomes. While tolling can generate revenue, that should not be the top priority.
  - ODOT should change the name to a "congestion pricing program."
  - Pricing should be variable based on level of congestion. More analysis and transparency is needed about toll rates and limits.
  - ODOT should also consider variability based on fuel efficiency and vehicle occupancy.
- Edits made prior to the meeting:
  - Revised the first bullet to acknowledge the revenue generating potential of tolling, but specify a recommendation that the top priority should be demand management
  - Added in a recommendation that ODOT change the toll program's name to a "congestion pricing program"
  - Added in a note that more analysis is needed about toll rates and possible limits in acknowledgement of the limited technical analysis we've had a chance to review
- Task Force discussion and recommendations during the meeting:
  - Task Force members suggested the language around variable pricing based on fuel efficiency or occupancy be softened, since variable charges may not be the best mechanism for achieving desired outcomes.
    - **Recommended revision of final bullet:** We further recommend additional ~~exploration consideration~~ of ~~variable-pricing based on policy designs that consider~~ fuel efficiency and vehicle occupancy to support climate goals.

## **Section 2: Use & Allocation of Tolling Revenue**

- Key points in the draft letter:
  - Toll revenue must be available to support multimodal investments, not just highway improvements
  - The City should advocate for changing the constitutional restriction
  - Toll revenue must also be available to address potential traffic diversion on local streets
  - Local and regional stakeholders must be involved in decision making around revenue allocation
- Edits made prior to the meeting:
  - Used active voice and removed unclear, wonky language (e.g. non-right-of-way; makes it “harder” to invest)
  - Clarified that the reason local and regional stakeholders must be involved is because they disproportionately feel the impacts of VMT and congestion
  - Otherwise, content largely stayed the same
- Task Force discussion and recommendations during the meeting:
  - **Reorganize Letter:** Task Force members suggested putting this section last in the letter since the first section discussed not prioritizing revenue generation.
  - **Constitutional Restriction-** Task Force members recommended using the word “amend” to ameliorate concerns that may arise around changing the constitutional restrictions. Additionally, they suggested clearly linking the proposed amendment to use of revenue for non-capital, multimodal investments
    - **Recommended revision to text:** Given that, we recommend the City advocate for [changing amending](#) the constitutional restriction [to allow for these types of non-capital, multimodal investments](#).

## **Section 3: Financial, Technology, & Enforcement Impacts on BIPOC Portlanders, Low-Income Drivers, and Persons with Disabilities:**

- Key points in the draft letter.
  - Discounts, exemptions, or rebates must be provided for low-income drivers, while still achieving demand management outcomes
  - Technology and payment systems should not burden unbanked populations & include strong privacy & enforcement protections; use existing means-testing systems wherever possible
  - Tickets and fines for non-compliance should be means-based, structured by income
- Edits made prior to the meeting:
  - Added “while still achieving demand management outcomes” to discounts bullet
  - Added some language to clarify meaning (e.g. means-based)
- Task Force Discussion & Comments
  - Define “unbanked”

- **Recommended revision to text:** Technology and payment systems must be designed to ~~be easy to access~~ **reduce barriers** for ~~unbanked populations~~ **individuals with limited access to bank accounts.**
  - Add in a bullet to this section about the importance of involving local and regional stakeholders in these design considerations:
    - **Recommended additional text:** **Local and regional stakeholders must be involved in designing the toll program to ensure equitable outcomes.**

## Final Voting Process

*Emma reviewed the process for voting to adopt this recommendation letter:*

- **Recap** final list of recommendations to include in letter
- **Vote 1:** Are we prepared to vote on the letter with any revisions discussed this evening?
  - Vote options: *Yes – Ready to Vote*, or *No – Need More Time*
    - If majority are not ready, postpone vote to next meeting
- **Vote 2:** Do you approve of adopting the recommendations in this letter and sending it to PBOT and BPS leadership?
  - Vote options: *Yes* or *No*
    - If majority vote thumbs up, letter will be distributed. Thumbs down voters will have opportunity to express reasoning, to be captured in the meeting minutes.
    - If majority vote thumbs down, the letter will not be adopted/sent
  - Task Force members not in attendance will have a chance to add their vote to the record

## Voting Outcome

- Vote 1: All indicated they were ready to vote
- Vote 2:
  - Supporting Votes (13) in favor
  - Dissenting Votes (1) against
    - One Task Force member voted in opposition of putting the Task Force letter forward. They expressed concern with the scope of the letter, expressing their hope that the letter would be focused around the constitutional restriction alone, a topic where there seemed to be widespread agreement among Task Force members, rather than bringing in additional topics on which there are different perspectives.

Following the meeting, four additional Task Force members indicated a vote in support of adopting the letter. The letter was officially adopted and distributed to leadership following the meeting.

## Next Steps & Wrap-Up

*Emma Sagor thanked participants for their participation and shared the topic for the next Task Force meeting.*

### **Meeting #14**

- Date: April 12, 2021 6 – 8 p.m.
- Topic(s):
  - Pricing “Sandbox” – modeling design parameters