

April 24, 2019

**Re: Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study - Scopes of Work (Agenda Item #36)**

**Dear Metro Chair Supervisor Sheila Kuehl and the Metro Board:**

Thank you for your ongoing support of equity. We appreciate having this opportunity to review the Technical and Communications Scope of Work for the Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study. We have reviewed both scopes and have two suggestions. We hope to see both of our suggestions addressed before either of the scopes are released for proposal. Here are our two suggestions:

- 1) **Use the Policy Advisory Council as the Congestion Pricing Stakeholder Panel to examine and provide feedback on Metro's congestion pricing program as it is designed**

If Metro uses the PAC instead of convening a new 10-member Stakeholder panel (per Attachment E, Panel 2), Metro leverages 3+ years of trust built among PAC members to examine Congestion Pricing. The PAC already convenes at least 10 members whose work (and role on the PAC) is to advance social equity, plus 20+ more members who represent diverse perspectives and a wide geographic reach. The PAC meets quarterly and more frequently, as needed, in working groups. Congestion pricing can be discussed in depth in a working group. PAC meetings are open to the public, thereby increasing transparency and inclusivity while expanding Metro's reach. If Metro's directors focus the PAC's already convened members on Congestion Pricing, Metro moves equity forward through Congestion Pricing and saves Metro time and money convening another council.

**We urge Metro's directors to commission the Policy Advisory Council as the panel that examines progress and shapes outcomes of the Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study.**

- 2) **Embed equity and the language: 'achieving equitable outcomes' in critical places of the scope of work to require equitable outcomes**

We have specific scope of work suggestions that help Metro move forward as strongly as possible with equity on Congestion Pricing. Specifically, we suggest embedding equity and, specifically the language: 'achieving equitable outcomes' into -- at least -- Tasks 5 (define alternatives) and 11 (define implementation) of the technical scope. In doing so, we require the selected consultant to necessarily involve equity in critical places of the study, in addition to Task 4 (equity analysis). We set the expectation that the selected consultant does not simply inform us of equity shortcomings but rather presents Metro's directors with choices -- *all of which achieve equitable outcomes*, thus empowering Metro to necessarily select equitable outcomes.

**We urge Metro's directors to embed equity and, specifically, the language: 'achieving equitable outcomes' into -- at least -- Tasks 5 (define alternatives) and 11 (define implementation) of the technical scope.**

Sincerely,

Jessica Meaney  
Investing in Place

Eli Akira Kaufman  
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition

David Diaz  
ActiveSGV

Bryn Lindblad  
Climate Resolve