DISCUSSION DRAFT
9/13/23

Key Policy Topics to Address for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan

This document summarizes five topics identified by Metro staff for more in-depth policy discussion by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council. For each topic, a summary of key concerns raised during the public comment period is provided. Potential recommended actions will be developed to serve as a starting point for discussion in October and November. The potential recommended actions are anticipated to reflect a combination of potential technical and policy recommendations.

Discussion Topic 1- Investment Emphasis – Project Mix and Timing

Key concerns	Potential recommended actions
1. Too much emphasis on throughway investment relative to other investments. 2. Not enough transit service relative to throughway investment levels, particularly in the near-term. 3. Not enough emphasis on completing gaps in active transportation network relative to throughway investment levels, particularly in the near-term. 4. Not enough emphasis on addressing the safety needs of urban arterials relative to throughway investment levels, particularly in the near-term. 5. Not enough emphasis on reducing climate pollution relative to throughway investment levels, particularly in the near-term.	*To be developed pending further discussion.*

DRAFT

DISCUSSION DRAFT
9/13/23

Discussion Topic 2 – RTP Pricing Policy Application to Toll Projects

Key concerns	Potential recommended actions
1. Concern about whether future MTIP amendments to advance ODOT tolling program projects will be subject to the RTP pricing policies and actions. 2. Toll project analysis has been insufficient to understand the impacts of potential diversion from tolling on traffic and safety on the local system. a. It is unclear how much diversion from tolling is actually occurring and how much is local travel that should be using local system versus long distance travel that should be using throughways. b. Concern for the potential for more fatal and serious injury crashes on urban arterials due to diversion of throughway travel on arterial streets that are already high injury corridors. This information is needed to identify potential mitigation projects. c. Need to recognize that diversion is highly dependent on local conditions (e.g., I-205 in West Linn vs. in East Portland) and therefore must be addressed at the mobility corridor level. 3. Concern that ODOT has not demonstrated how tolling projects in the RTP (e.g., I-205 Toll Project and Regional Mobility Pricing Project) will help meet state and regional climate and safety goals and GHG reduction targets.	*To be developed pending further discussion.*

DRAFT

Discussion Topic 3 – Increasing regional transportation investments

Key concerns	Potential recommended actions
1. Inadequate funding to meet the region's currently identified needs and RTP goals; the gas tax continues to fall behind in the near-term and not viable in long-term, yet it is unclear whether new revenues such as congestion pricing, VMT/road user fee will fill this gap. 2. There is not regional agreement on how to prioritize existing or new funding.	*To be developed pending further discussion.*

Discussion Topic 4 - Mobility Policy Implementation

Key concerns	Potential recommended actions
1. Concerns about how (measures and processes) and when the Regional Mobility Policy must be implemented through Transportation System Plans and local comprehensive plan amendments (land use decisions).	*To be developed pending further discussion.*

DRAFT

Discussion Topic 5 - Climate Tools and Analysis

Key concerns	Potential recommended actions
1. Concern that the RTP climate analysis and Climate Smart Strategy did not meaningfully inform RTP investment priorities, as indicated by the high level of investment in freeway projects relative to investment in transit, biking and walking projects. 2. Concern that key Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) assumptions provided by the state for the RTP climate analysis are lagging, in particular new road user charges, vehicle fleet mix, share of electric vehicles, and vehicle fleet turnover. Commenters noted several specific areas where the documentation is inadequate or fails to describe how state policies and programs will reverse trends that currently appear to be moving in the wrong direction and driving an increase in carbon emissions. 3. Concern that Metro and the State are using VisionEval for climate analysis in the STS, STIP and RTP, whereas MOVES, the federally-approved emissions analysis tool, is being used for emissions analysis of major projects in the NEPA process.	*To be developed pending further discussion.*

DRAFT