



Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting**
Date/time: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual video conference call meeting via Zoom

Members Attending

Eryn Kehe, Chair
Joseph Edge
Carol Chesarek
Victor Saldanha
Tom Armstrong
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich
Laura Terway
Steve Koper
Katherine Kelly
Jamie Stasny
Jessica Pelz
Neelam Dorman
Laura Kelly
Manuel Contreras, Jr.
Gery Keck
Cindy Detchon
Tom Bouillion
Tara O'Brien
Bret Marchant
Brett Morgan
Rachel Loftin
Preston Korst
Mike O'Brien

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County Community Member
Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
Largest City in the Region: Portland
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin
City of Vancouver
Clackamas County
Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Clackamas Water Environmental Services
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
North Clackamas School District
Port of Portland
TriMet
Greater Portland, Inc.
1000 Friends of Oregon
Community Partners for Affordable Housing
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Green Infrastructure/Sustainability, Mayer/Reed, Inc.

Alternate Members Attending

Vee Paykar
Faun Hosey
Mary Phillips
Jean Senechal Biggs
Martha Fritzie
Sarah Paulus
Glen Bolen
Cassera Phipps
Jerry Johnson
Aaron Golub
Jacqui Treiger
Craig Sheahan
Brendon Haggerty
Ryan Ames

Affiliate

Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
Largest City in Multnomah County: Gresham
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Clean Water Services
Johnson Economics, LLC
Environmental Advocacy Org: Portland State U.
Oregon Environmental Council
David Evans & Associates, Inc.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah Co.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington Co.

Guests Attending

Allison Boyd
Ariadna
Brian Hurley
Chris Ford
Dakota Meyer
Dyami Valentine
Eric Hesse
Indi Namkoong
Jaimie Lorenzini
Karen Buehrig
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Max Nonnamaker
Sarah Iannarone
Three phone callers

Affiliate

Multnomah County
GTT
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Troutdale
Washington County
City of Portland
Verde
City of Happy Valley
Clackamas County
Washington State Dept. of Transportation
Multnomah County Health Department
The Street Trust

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Cindy Pederson, Eryn Kehe, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Marie Miller, Thaya Patton, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster

Call to Order, Quorum Declaration and Introductions

Chair Eryn Kehe called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was declared. Introductions were made. Zoom logistics and meeting features were reviewed for online raised hands, renaming yourself, finding attendees and participants, and chat area for messaging and sharing links. An overview of the agenda was given.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

- **Updates from committee members around the Region** – none given.

Public Communications on Agenda Items

Sarah Iannarone, The Street Trust asked for consideration with four aspects highlighted: pricing, mobility, safety and oversight. Pricing: this is critical but only if you implement them in ways that ensure trust with local government, including revenue sharing proceeds of pricing, the right of way must be dedicated to funding for mitigating climate change and achieving equity. The best mechanisms for this are making sure revenues go toward public transit and active transportation alternatives to regressive expenses of maintaining and operating a private vehicle, estimated by AAA as over \$12,000 a year. We need continued oversight to ensure alignment between ODOT Nexus projects and RTP policies, making sure that any of the Nexus projects that aren't in the RTP stay in line with RTP policies.

Two, on mobility, I know there is a lot of work to be done, understanding the impacts of accurately pricing the system, especially in terms of diversion. I think the RTP can provide a framework. We need to ensure local jurisdictions have the tools they need to deal with congestion and road safety. And for this reason I think it's critical that the 3 measures in the mobility policy are implemented in tandem. I recommend rejection of any proposed amendments that unbundle or disconnect them.

JPACT has directed staff to work with ODOT on unbundling on I-205 to provide more specificity about the location and project details to increase transparency and enable projects to be included in the final RTP system analysis. We support the proposed prioritization.

In terms of oversight one of the things we've seen is a very improved RTP through community participation. We would like to keep the subcommittees as written. Do not allow them to be emitted through amendment, and actually expand representations to 50% JPACT members and 50% community voices.

Consideration of MTAC minutes September 20, 2023 meeting

MOTION: To approve MTAC minutes from September 20, 2023 meeting.

Moved: Tara O'Brien

Seconded: Neelam Dorman

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with three abstentions: Jean Senechal Biggs, Sarah Paulus, Michael O' Brien

Adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (Ordinance No. 23-1496) Recommendation to MPAC (Kim Ellis, Metro) An overview of how the process for making recommendations to MPAC at this meeting was provided. MTAC action items include:

1. Recommend approval of the "consent" items as a bundle (Part 2 to Exhibit C)
2. Make individual recommendations on each "discussion" item (Part 1 to Exhibit C)
3. Take final action on an overall recommendation to MPAC on adoption of the 2023 RTP, including:
 - Approval of the "consent" items (*Part 2 to Exhibit C*)
 - Approval of the "discussion" items (*Part 1 to Exhibit C*)
 - Approval of Ordinance (*Ordinance No. 23-1496 and its Exhibits A, B and C*)

The process with making motions and amendments was reviewed. It was recommended to have amendment changes/additions/edits clearly identified during the process and sharing screen for visible language was encouraged. The committee was reminded the Public Comment Report documents all comments received on RTP and HCT Strategy, and Staff recommendations address public comments with specific changes to both the RTP and HCT Strategy.

Staff recommendations were presented in two parts:

- **Part 1 - Key policy topics to consider individually** – focus of final discussions (*Exhibit C – Part 1*)
- **Part 2 - Consent items to consider in a bundle** – corrections and adjustments to be considered for approval by Consent, without discussion (*Exhibit C – Part 2*)

Beginning with Consent Items (Exhibit C – part 2), it was asked if there were any proposed items to be moved to the discussion items.

MOTION: To have poll comment #345 removed from the consent items, related to the 2040 Refresh project, and moved to the discussion items.

Moved: Martha Fritzie

Seconded: Manny Contreras

Discussion on motion:

Ms. Fritzie noted Clackamas County has submitted requested changes related to the language identified in comment #345. In your document it says it's been amended as requested. However it omits an important component of the request we sent. We think it should more clearly describe the land use and transportation connections and direct statement of the need to look at regional balance of economic development opportunities and transportation system investments that support our growing community. Karen Buehrig had sent additional language to add there.

ACTION: Motion passed with one opposed: Joseph Edge. One abstaining: Neelam Dorman.

MOTION: To approve Consent Items with comment #345 removed.

Moved: Jessica Pelz

Seconded: Joseph Edge

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion items (*Exhibit C – Part 1*)

1. Investment emphasis recommendations: Better align the project list with RTP goals and policies

- **Project list adjustments** in the 2023 RTP, including unbundling of ODOT safety project
- Regular **reports on safety** investments
- **Improve project list development and review process for 2028 RTP**
 - JPACT oversight with community and business leaders
 - Improve metrics and evaluation tools
 - Policy guidance for project sponsors
 - Longer review and refinement period

MOTION: To approve staff recommendation with additional changes shared by MTAC and TPAC on October 11 as reflected to attachment 1 to the Metro staff memo in the packet, and those added by the City of Happy Valley. (*shown on screen*)

Moved: Martha Fritzie

Seconded: Manny Contreras

Discussion on motion:

Sarah Paulus did not agree with striking #1 as we don't have a huge reason to remove this. We need to address concerns here. If this is the Metro staff recommendation, we would support it. I think that the language is OK in the investment emphasis vs being represented in pricing policy, for example, because I think this is a little broader than just addressing the pricing policy.

Martha Fritzie noted we felt it was unnecessary to include in this item because it's covered in the infrastructure funding item. I feel it's more redundant but putting it back in could be considered.

Katherine Kelly agreed with Ms. Fritzie's comment. More on the background of this was asked. Ms. Ellis noted what Ms. Fritzie said and some this accounted for in the pricing policy and not topic 3, the regional funding. The pricing policy implementation recommendations are aimed at ensuring these, particularly the toll projects are accountable to previously adopted commitment. Ms. Kelly would support what Ms. Fritzie was saying and retain the striking of #1.

Jean Senechal Biggs agreed with striking and just knowing where we have this captured elsewhere around the funding. Ms. Paulus noted this was helpful. We want to ensure that this is represented somewhere. And I think if Metro is saying that it's OK represented in the pricing policy and that it's not limiting the message of this in any way then I think that's helpful.

Ms. Ellis not that the pricing policy does not account for the Rose Quarter project. That does not have a pricing element to it. The Interstate Bridge Replacement program does have a pricing element and their previously JPACT and Metro Council adopted modified LPA (locally preferred alternative) for that. There were specific commitments as part of the adoption of the LPA. The toll project would be captured within the pricing policy implementation recommendations specifically. It's not fully encapsulated in policy topic 2 recommendations and those accountabilities.

Sarah Paulus noted the thing we're trying to get to is, since it's not fully encapsulated, we would like to leave this language here to capture the things that aren't part of the pricing. Neelam Dorman noted these were along the same lines of redundancy but also that this particular item is quite vague, and ensuring accountability is a pretty big statement. I think leaving something in there we'd need to add a little bit more definition to it.

Joseph Edge asked would it be sufficient to enumerate the I-5 Rose Quarter project in the pricing policy language. Would that allow us to strike this here and retain kind of the spirit in the pricing policy? Ms. Ellis noted the Rose Quarter project does not have a pricing element to it. This has been through past adoption actions by JPACT and Metro Council and that project has moved forward into different stages of the NEPA process. I wouldn't advise that you work to include that in the pricing policy. Again, this topic area is around ensuring that projects advance the regional goals, particularly around safety, climate and equity, and ensuring that past actions that have been taken around these 3 projects are working to advance those 3 goals. So it is a separate issue that it's trying to get at than just simply how the tolling policy is implemented, but that those projects follow through on the things that have been adopted by Council to advance safety, climate and equity priorities in the RTP.

Chair Kehe asked Ms. Fritzie if she would approve an amendment to her original motion. Ms. Fritzie noted she would prefer the strikeout remain. The other concern is that why we are talking about accountability being discussed under investment emphasis and priorities. I'm not sure what the easiest route is to get through discussion and vote. But I could accept this as a friendly amendment even reached in a roundabout way. Chair Kehe noted the amendment to the motion to retain #1 language.

Asked if there were further edits proposed by Ms. Dorman, it was noted no particular proposals. I think when we talk about the pricing piece and item 2 we provide a little bit more detail. For item 1 it's a little vague as to what the ensuring accountability means. And I don't see what the action is. Is that a report, a letter, a vote? It's hard to gauge on this. And then the items it's referring to have been codified in letters and actions. So ensuring accountability, again, moving right back to it and kind of redundant that those actions have been taken. I leave it to Metro staff to see if they have a better language proposal.

Ms. Ellis noted the language proposal points back to the adopted actions so we can enumerate what those adopted actions are. There's an LPA that was adopted. There's the I-205 ordinance that amended the PE where there's specific amendments or specific commitments and were identified through that. And then there are other actions that have also been taken on the I-5 Rose Quarter project. So it is pointing back to adopted commitments that JPACT and Council have taken on these projects. It's really ensuring that as these projects move forward we're looking back at those adopted commitments and ensuring that they are, in fact, continuing to be part of the project as were approved by JPACT and Council. It's not ambiguous. Certainly we can reference and add or find a place to have those commitments be more expressly identified or reflected in the final action.

Chair Kehe asked that the strikeout be removed after agreement from the motion. Ms. Dorman asked, on that discussion, are we also looking to add other projects that have LPAs and potential agreements as part of that? If we are looking at Burnside Bridge or those projects into this list as well? Ms. Ellis noted we can do that. We do have a LPA for the Burnside Bridge, but other LPAs adopted are not known off the top of the head.

The motion with friendly amendments from discussion was shown on screen. It was asked if there was any other discussion, proposed amendments and language changes to suggest on the topic. Katherine Kelly noted, as a point of clarification, Ms. Fritzie has accepted a friendly amendment retaining what Metro staff had proposed to strike. I would say these are separate issues. If it's captured in the pricing policy that's really what this is getting to. To Ms. Ellis's point on the safety, climate and equity pieces those lie elsewhere and the commitments in particular with IBR through the modified locally preferred alternative rest in those actions. I would make a pitch that we retain the striking. I think it will be confusing for impacts if this remains or the striking gets removed.

Tara O'Brien noted that since we're looking at the full Metro action recommendation on screen, I'm trying to reference where there was additional reference to the need for coordination with other entities around reforming the call for projects. This strikes a JPACT subcommittee but there was also a commitment of some form beyond just Metro working on this with coordination with local jurisdictions or TPAC referenced in the broader actions. This was confirmed by Ms. Ellis. Reference to pg. 38 in the packet was made with the full set of Metro staff recommended actions. Those highlighted in yellow as strikeout refer to JPACT subcommittee doing the review of project list development process and providing more policymaker oversight of the call for projects. Striking all agencies align investment priorities was suggested due to it being something agencies do already.

Joseph Edge asked, with the recent changes from the climate friendly and equitable communities to the transportation planning rule, is that going to fundamentally change the way we do project prioritization? Wouldn't it be helpful to have a subcommittee that worked on this, that this is really intended to compliment the changes that we know are coming from the TRP revisions? Or is this something completely different?

Ms. Ellis agreed. The changes to the transportation planning rule will change everyone's transportation system plan. It's changing the RTP as part of the update. Four B will happen with or without this recommendation. That was the point Clackamas County recommended removing it since it will affect

how things are planned and implemented, through future TSP updates. The RTP policies and goals align with the transportation planning rule changes, and updated mobility policy also aligns with that.

Joseph Edge offered a friendly amendment that we undo the strikeout on 4a iii.

Martha Fritzie noted this recommendation was made because we think it's unnecessary to create a subcommittee. The process really needs to focus on local TSP priorities. The CFEC will change the way that the local jurisdictions are prioritizing. JPACT will still be involved in all this. But we don't feel that a subcommittee is necessary on top of all the other feedback loops and the work that the local jurisdictions are doing on their own TSPs.

Chair Kehe called the question on the main motion following discussion and amendments considered.

MOTION SUMMARY: Recommendation 1 reinstated "Ensure Accountability: Ensure project partners for the Interstate Bridge Replacement Program, I-5 Rose Quarter Project and the I-205 Toll Project are accountable to adopted commitments and desired outcomes to address safety, climate and equity priorities for each project."

Cross outs to 4 a ii and iii left as strikeouts.

New recommendation 5 as written:

5. Continue to improve coordination and support for small jurisdictions.

i. Following adoption of the 2023 RTP, develop strategies to support smaller jurisdictions to be more effective for funding opportunities.

iii. Prior to the 2028 RTP Call for Projects, consider strategies to improve coordination on submitting projects on state or multi-jurisdictional facilities.

ACTION: Motion passed by majority. Four opposed. One abstention: Laura Kelly.

Discussion items (Exhibit C – Part 1)

2. Pricing policy implementation recommendations: Ensure regional concerns are addressed in NEPA processes and in project implementation.

- **Ensure NEPA processes address local and regional concerns related to tolling** and follow through on project partner commitments
- **Apply RTP pricing policy** in future JPACT and Metro Council decisions on toll projects

MOTION: To approve staff recommendations to Policy Topic 2 (with additional amendments proposed during the motion (shown on screen)

Moved: Neelam Dorman

Seconded: Jessica Pelz

Neelam Dorman shared screen with ODOT edits:

Recommendation 1:

Delete 1a and replace with the following: "1a. As established under Oregon Revised Statute Chapter 383, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) is the state's tolling authority and decision-maker on allocation of toll revenues. The use of toll revenues is subject to federal laws, the Oregon Constitution (Article IX, section 3a), state law, the Oregon Highway Plan, and OTC Policy. Specific allocation decisions regarding the revenues from toll projects are made by the OTC using an extensive public engagement process.

Tolling efforts for the IBR program will be developed in a bi-state process involving the legislatures, transportation commissions, and departments of transportation from both Oregon and Washington. The OTC and WSTC will jointly determine toll rates and toll policies for the IBR program. However, unlike in Oregon where the OTC determines how toll revenue is spent; in Washington, the Legislature, not the WSTC, has this authority

ODOT and regional partners will work together to understand the potential revenues from the I-205 and RMPP projects, and the amount of net revenue that may be available to fund projects that address safety and diversion impacts to local streets from tolling on ODOT facilities. JPACT and Metro Council shall coordinate with regional partners on a proposed toll revenue sharing approach to address safety and diversion impacts from tolling and work together to expand transportation options along priced corridors. JPACT and Metro Council shall provide testimony to the OTC in support of their proposed toll revenue sharing approach.”

Revise 1b. as follows, “ODOT must bring the work of the Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC) into the analysis, discussion and influencing decision-making about the revenue raising potential of tolling and/or pricing consistent with EMAC’s foundational statements accepted by the OTC. Due to the bi-state nature of the IBR program, the advisory committees established by ODOT for the Oregon Toll Program will not be the entities utilized for the IBR program. The IBR program will work with the OTC and WSTC to identify the process for incorporating public, advisory group, and partner agency input around toll rate-setting and policies.”

Revise 1c. as follows, “ODOT ~~should~~ will evaluate, document and address diversion on local routes where diversion is identified at the mobility corridor level as part of the ongoing NEPA projects analyses underway, such as: consistent with Federal Requirements.

i. ODOT/RMPP technical team should produce one set of maps for each RMPP Option based on select-link analysis that show the major routes in the region conveying vehicles to/from I-5/I-205, including identified mobility corridors. a series of flow bundle (select link) maps that can visualize the origins and destinations of users of I-5 and I-205 for the different RMPP project options.

Delete 1e and replace with the following: “1e. Consistent with the ongoing I-205 NEPA processes, ODOT will utilize the Metro Regional Travel Demand Model and other models that rely on state, regional and local data to evaluate tolling options for I-205. ODOT will conduct a separate analysis to determine if a managed lane concept on I-205 between OR43 and Stafford Road is viable. This analysis will include an evaluation of using one or more managed lanes to address congestion, raise revenues for needed expansion, and minimize diversion in the project area.”

Delete 1d. “1d. TPAC and JPACT should identify what is reconciled and not reconciled with the ODOT nexus project list and ODOT Public Transportation Strategy projects so there is a clear way to track post RTP adoption.” (later included as a friendly amendments to the ODOT motion)

Delete 1f. “1f. JPACT and Metro Council should clarify expectation of ODOT to prepare findings that document how the RTP pricing policies and actions, and previous ODOT commitments adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council are addressed when requesting JPACT and the Metro Council consideration of future MTIP amendments for toll projects.”

Discussion on motion:

Katherine Kelly noted that the Washington State Transportation Commission actually does recommend how the revenues will be allocated. So I’m not sure how this sentence fully captures accurately how that happens. I’m just wondering if it actually even needs to be in here, and what the intent and purpose of including that here is, just so I can further understand your context. Ms. Dorman noted we’re defining what the state policies are and who the allocating authority is given to. Our IBR team put this together as standard language they’ve had in other documents. The OTC is not the decision making authority for anything dealing with IBR toll revenues. However, unlike in Oregon where the OTC determines all toll revenues spent, in Washington, the legislature, not Washington State Transportation Commission, has the authority. Ms. Kelly was comfortable with the language if the IBR team had been consulted. (1a)

Tom Armstrong noted the last sentence “shall provide testimony to the OTC in support of their proposed toll revenue sharing approach”. I don’t think “in support of” is the right wording since we don’t know what this is and if JPACT and Metro Council would support it. Ms. Dorman noted, yes, that was a little difficult language. We’re not saying what the proposed is. This proposed is referring to what was stated in the first sentence that says regional partners will come up with a proposal toll revenue sharing, and then JPACT and Metro Council will then take that proposed one and share and support it at OTC. This later read “in support of their proposed toll revenue approach”. (1a)

Kim Ellis wanted to clarify the last statement made by Ms. Dorman proposing to delete 1f and replace language. It was noted this is not a new process. This is pointing to, again, the past actions that have been adopted by JPACT and the Council as the basis for ensuring that as those projects go forward there is documentation, and this is specific to the pricing policy implementation. All projects go through a review of are they consistent with the RTP policies. But there are specific actions that have been adopted by JPACT and Council of which this letter of agreement is not an adopted JPACT/Council action. But it is a reflection of that adopted commitment. I want to be clear that this is not a new process. (1f)

Martha Fritzie proposed an amendment to include the items that were recommended from Clackamas County identified in attachment 1, which would include striking 1d that was not seen from Ms. Dorman’s motion. There are also changes to Chapter 8 proposed:

Revise Page 8-68, Section 8.3.1.6 to add: “As the I-205 Toll Project develops and future phases and cost adjustments are amended into the MTIP, reports shall be submitted documenting consistency on compliance with the Chapter 3 Pricing Policies.

Revise Page 8-70, Section 8.3.1.7 to add: “As the I-5 & I-205 Regional Mobility Pricing Project develops and future phases and cost adjustments are amended into the MTIP, reports shall be submitted documenting consistency on compliance with the Chapter 3 Pricing Policies.”

Neelam Dorman noted Chapter 8 proposed changes were broad in text stated. There's no defined parameters around reports, so that's something we're not comfortable with. The EP process already has the report that looks back at all of the policies. We should probably have the same process for all large processes. I will friendly amend to include the strikeout for 1d, but not the text edits proposed sections 8.3.1.6 and 8.3.1.7.

MOTION: To add the proposed changes to Chapter 8 Sections 8.3.1.6 and 8.3.1.7 (above) to the staff recommendations.

Moved: Martha Fritzie

Seconded: Manny Contreras

Discussion on the motion:

Neelam Dorman noted going back to the passed investment mix, including those projects and including the ensure accountability text, this also seems repetitive again because we've gone back to the bigger investment mix. We called out our I-205 project and IBR project. To do more text on ensuring accountability text here feels repetitive.

Ms. Ellis noted this is very separate from the investment mix. This is specifically to address how the tolling policy is implemented as those projects come forward for future MTIP amendments. Right now only the preliminary engineering phase for the I-205 project is included in the MTIP. As that project goes forward there will be future MTIP amendments to provide funding to continue to move that along toward implementation, including construction phases of that project. So what this is doing is making sure that as that project comes forward for future phases or cost adjustment, there's demonstration of consistency with the pricing policies that have been developed as part of this process and updating the RTP. This is totally separate from the investment emphasis. This is very specific to ensuring that the pricing policies are being implemented as the project goes forward into future phases of work. Ms. Fritzie agreed that the intent is to provide clarity with the tolling projects to align with RTP policies as they evolve.

Neelam Dorman asked that if in Chapter 8 this is defining Metro's work plan, correct? An action for Metro to complete since it's under Chapter 8? Ms. Ellis noted this would be the project demonstrating how it's meeting consistency. Chapter 8 includes Metro work and includes work of other partners that also has corridor refinement planning and project development descriptions. The two sections that are proposed to be amended and the public review draft plan are specific to the I-205 toll project and the I-5/I-205 regional mobility pricing project. It's adding specific actions to those efforts to their project descriptions and the planning work that's happening.

Discussion on motion was closed. Chair Kehe called for a vote:

MOTION: To add the proposed changes to Chapter 8 Sections 8.3.1.6 and 8.3.1.7 to the staff recommendations.

Revise Page 8-68, Section 8.3.1.6 to add: "As the I-205 Toll Project develops and future phases and cost adjustments are amended into the MTIP, reports shall be submitted documenting consistency on compliance with the Chapter 3 Pricing Policies.

Revise Page 8-70, Section 8.3.1.7 to add: “As the I-5 & I-205 Regional Mobility Pricing Project develops and future phases and cost adjustments are amended into the MTIP, reports shall be submitted documenting consistency on compliance with the Chapter 3 Pricing Policies.”

ACTION: Motion passed by majority with one opposing and three abstaining.

Discussion on the main motion:

Tara O’Brien noted, regarding 1f, previous discussion about this and what it would mean and how it is different, if at all, from existing processes that Metro goes through for MTIP amendments. Looking at the original text, my understanding is that for MTIP amendments, especially larger amendments, Metro already does a policy check on how this aligns with our policies. Is this simply calling it out for alignment for pricing projects? Ms. Ellis agreed.

Ms. O’Brien noted ODOT’s changes do seem to remove any reference to the existing MTIP process, which I believe was the intention of Metro, just to acknowledge that original need to check back with both commitments and the policy process. I’m interested if there is the ability to reference that process. Are there any consequences to this change to the original proposal? Ms. Ellis note the MTIP process goes through JPACT and Metro Council for action. Ms. Dorman noted the ODOT language is pulling it into the letter of agreement.

Tom Armstrong noted it was not understood why the ODOT proposed amendment is cutting out the MTIP process and why we can’t still call that out because that seems to be the point of leverage that the region has over this whole process. That is the one vote that JPACT and Metro Council take that is needed for these projects. And to not speak to it in this proposal is at the very least confusing. We should call it out if that is still the process that it will go through.

Sarah Paulus agreed. We should see the connection to the MTIP spelled out. I would prefer the Metro staff language for 1f be approved and not what ODOT is proposing. Neelam Dorman was asked she wanted to change or edit 1f. It was noted it would leave as is.

Brett Morgan asked for clarification on where 1f sits relative to Clackamas County amendments vs what’s in the staff recommendation. There was interest to speak of some of the ideas espoused in the Clackamas County edits, and also concern about removal of the environmental assessment process as a consideration in this. Clarity or contrast on what was in the staff report vs what’s in the adopted amendments so far would be helpful.

Ms. Ellis noted, 1f proposed by ODOT to be reworded was made into a friendly amendment to stay as the staff recommendation:

1f. JPACT and Metro Council should clarify expectation of ODOT to prepare findings that document how the RTP pricing policies and actions, and previous ODOT commitments adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council are addressed when requesting JPACT and the Metro Council consideration of future MTIP amendments for toll projects.

What was proposed by Clackamas County for Chapter 8 revisions (and approved) calls out both the consistency with the pricing policies and consistency with past commitments that have been made by ODOT in terms of the work that will be done for these toll projects.

Ms. Dorman confirmed the proposed new text from ODOT for 1f has been removed for consideration, leaving the text from staff recommendation.

Discussion was closed. Chair Kehe called for a vote:

MOTION: To accept staff recommendations on Policy Topic 2 with edits proposed by ODOT that were accepted, adding Chapter 8 additions from Clackamas County proposal and accepting staff recommendation 1f as written.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstaining: Brett Morgan.

Discussion items (*Exhibit C – Part 1*)

3. Regional transportation funding recommendations: Secure more funding for projects that advance regional goals

- Expand regional efforts to bring more transportation funding to the region
- Develop annual JPACT work program for 2024
- Participate in State level funding discussions
- Prepare for 2025 Legislative session
- Increase competitiveness for Federal funding opportunities
- Research on potential new revenues
- Secure long-term funding for transit

MOTION: To approve Metro staff recommendation with one amendment proposed. Revise 1a.

“...developing state and federal funding legislative priorities position supported by JPACT and the Metro Council, including the need to maintain the transportation system, invest more in transit and active transportation, address resiliency of bridges and the system, and create dedicated funding for active transportation, transit, and Willamette River and other major bridges.”

Moved: Jessica Pelz

Seconded: Steve Koper

Discussion on motion:

Laura Terway proposed a friendly amendment Add new 1e.: “develop effective strategies to fund and implement transportation infrastructure in Urban Growth Boundary expansion areas and adjacent networks to meet urban multimodal standards and support complete communities consistent with the Regional Growth Concept.”

Sarah Paulus noted, regarding the proposed strikeout from 1a, I think we want to make sure that there’s a specific project about funding for the Willamette River bridges and the Willamette River bridge project in Chapter 8 is kept. Whereas if in Chapter 8 you do more of a combined funding project, then we would want to keep that language in there and not strikeout. Ms. Ellis noted I think Metro staff recommended retaining the Willamette River bridge section in Chapter 8 that’s already there but I would like to verify that.

Jean Senechal Biggs noted she spoke about the 1e proposed amendment addressing urban growth expansion areas during the past workshop. This refined language is a place that came from a team effort and supports the friendly amendment. Tara O'Brien felt 1e is an improvement on the language but it does seem to still focus on investing outside the urban growth boundary and not just improving transportation infrastructure, both rural roadways inside the UGB and outside. Could this just be combined with the list of other things this subcommittee may consider? It seems like this focuses more on outside UGB development than just acknowledging the many needs. I wonder if there's either a potential slight amendment to this language to reference also improving rural roadways inside existing UGB.

Ms. Senechal Biggs noted she was the one that first put the rural roads in and then worked to remove it. This is now very honed in on the urban growth areas which several communities in the region are actively doing planning to conceive how these areas develop in ways that are consistent with the growth management plan. With the policies of the RTP our challenge is that, when we look at either the existing arterial and collector infrastructure that where funding for those roadways are where we don't have good funding mechanisms. Urban growth areas are where we requested that they become included. They are there for us to do that planning work to incorporate them into our cities. I hear what you're saying, but it's not a focus on investment outside the UGB. It's saying Metro told us to put together more housing in these areas and we're trying to address those needs. This language addresses time to focus on this issue.

Brett Morgan appreciated the discussion which gives more context to understand where this fits in. In particular 1000 Friends is always paying close attention when we see the UGB topic. I think I have agreement with some of what Ms. O'Brien said about understanding how this fits into the other components of the committee and the oversight. Is there other language that we could include just to be more specific because I hear that point that we need to make sure we are transportation planning and long range planning and investments at the edge of our UGB and already identified expansion areas is important.

But hearing this comment on its own also begets the fact that there's an intentionality and need to make sure that we're developing and improving upon transportation infrastructure within our current facilities, and not just the areas we intend to expand upon and the interrelationship of existing facilities to expansion areas. As a general note, a concern about a long-term plan is what is the management plan for our roadway systems as we face a decline in the gas tax and other revenue sources. What is the ability to maintain and effectively utilize our current facility? I have some apprehension about some of the language here, but I understand better where some of this comes from. If there was a way to friendly amend and include some language about ensuring that we're also prioritizing infill and also just the idea that we're improving upon and investing in current UGB areas feels important.

Laura Terway noted in order to plan for roadway in UGB expansion areas there's this downstream effect (utilities, etc.) which will cause issues for our roadways with the city as well. You can't look at them separately. It's a combined thing. I want to make sure that we're intentionally thinking about how to help solve some of these infrastructure problems to provide additional housing and be more intentional about how to address issues in the UGB so that we can provide more readiness.

Jean Senechal Biggs asked for Policy 3 be displayed on screen. It was felt we have captured concerns discussed in 1a-c including new funding sources to replace the gas tax. Ms. Ellis showed Policy 3 onscreen. It was felt we deferred to the highlighted 1a recommendation to retain a description of the Willamette River bridges or just retain what's in the current RTP. I would recommend you make that as either a motion or a friendly amendment. Text highlighting what was recommended to be removed in the original motion to this action was shown.

Martha Fritzie felt retaining this was important. It's not replacing anything. I think funding for new expansion areas coming into the UGB is extremely important because it's very difficult. I think the language proposed is clear about the improvements inside the UGB. It doesn't appear to interpret as outside the UGB. I would support removing everything past "Metro Council" that Washington County proposed because once you start a list of items to include, this becomes the list. You run the risk of missing something.

Mike O' Brien suggested that in the language for 1e adding after areas, say "and adjacent networks" just to allow, because I agree with what I understand the sentiment to be is that we need to make sure that all the infrastructure going into the expansion areas is as refined and capable of meeting the needs as the new infrastructure in the expansion areas. It says you have to do both. Ms. Pelz agreed to this added language to her motion.

Sarah Paulus understood people struggling with the list seeming inclusive. If we are losing the call out, it sounds like in Chapter 8 for the bridges we're just concerned that we wouldn't have that language here either. So if people don't want that, what seems to be a comprehensive list, another option could be that we just address the needs of the bridges as reflected in Chapter 8 project. That was the public comment draft. Ms. Ellis noted a clean way to do this would be to recommend retaining section 8 in Chapter 8 of the RTP which is the funding strategy for regional bridges. Ms. Pelz agreed to this as a friendly amendment.

Brett Morgan suggested a friendly amendment that would be at the beginning of it, with community engagement, develop effective strategies to fund and implement. This may be redundant, but I think worth calling out due to some conversations playing out in urban growth expansion areas and there's more work we can do to better communicate and articulate vision and plan.

Jessica Pelz didn't agree with the amendment because we always do community engagement through these planning processes. And a lot of it comes down to municipal financing and funding of transportation investments. This friendly amendment was not accepted as part of the motion.

Tara O'Brien asked if we were still calling out bridges as its' own in Chapter 8 and calling out 1e as a portion of this. Is this getting away from the comments to originally have a subcommittee working at the need for funding and new revenue sources, specifically the JPACT subcommittee? It was suggested to add "such as" and add "Great Streets" after transit in 1e.

Discussion was closed. Chair Kehe called for a vote:

MOTION: To accept staff recommendations with one discussed and friendly amendments approved.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstaining.

Discussion items (Exhibit C – Part 1)

4. Climate tools and analysis recommendations: Improve tools to better inform policy and investment decisions that impact climate

- Update climate analysis to reflect current fleet mix and age
- Continue to improve evaluation and modeling tools to assess the climate impacts of transportation investments
- Request state review of key state assumptions underlying region’s climate strategy and targets
- Take actions to support EV transition

MOTION: To approve Metro staff recommendation with additions proposed by Clackamas County to Recommendation 5:

“5. Take action to support Federal and State electrification efforts: Update Chapter 8 to identify actions for improved coordination and assessing the needs and gaps ~~add creation of a electric vehicle (EV) action plan that identifies~~ in local and regional actions to advance transportation electrification in the greater Portland region a way that complements existing state and federal policies and programs. Potential local and regional actions may include: ...”

Moved: Martha Fritzie

Seconded: Manny Contreras

Discussion on the motion:

Tara O’Brien noted we support these changes. I think it just slightly scales down expectations about level of effort around this and focuses on just the need for coordination and really identifying needs and gaps. Not presupposing that we need a regional EV action plan necessarily, but that identification of needs and gaps can dictate next steps.

Discussion was closed. Chair Kehe called for a vote:

MOTION: To approve Metro staff recommendation with additions proposed by Clackamas County to Recommendation 5

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstaining.

Discussion items (Exhibit C – Part 1)

5. Mobility policy implementation recommendations: Finalize the mobility policy to inform system planning needs and support local land use decisions.

- Continue shift from a sole focus on congestion to a broader multimodal approach that prioritizes access, efficiency, equity, safety, reliability, and travel options
- Complete work with local and state partners before implementation:
 - Develop approach and guidance for use of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and multimodal system completeness measures to inform land use decisions
 - Review travel speed threshold for throughways with traffic signals and use of VMT per employee measure

MOTION: To approve Metro staff recommendation with one change. Move to strike sections 3.2.5.2 (Mobility policy system planning actions) and 3.2.5.3 (Mobility policy plan amendments evaluation actions) from RTP Chapter 3.

Added as a friendly amendment to the motion: Adding the following language to Chapter 3, page 3-57 that clearly states “since implementing the mobility performance targets and thresholds are more complex than in the past the following description of their application is an example and will be refined further within the Regional Transportation Functional Plan update”.

Moved: Jessica Pelz

Seconded: Martha Fritzie

Discussion on the motion:

Laura Terway proposed a friendly amendment

- Update action 1.d as follows, “d. Define future analysis needed to determine an appropriate ~~throughway speed threshold~~ reliability metrics for signalized throughways and that this work will be completed in collaboration with affected jurisdictions and the Metro Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee as part of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan update (2024-25) and in coordination with the update to the Oregon Highway Plan (2023-24)”

Neelam Dorman proposed broadening the language of 1d to allow for some flexibility in the language (shown on screen and added to the above amendment). Tara O’Brien asked is reliability metrics inclusive of freeway speed thresholds. Ms. Dorman noted speed will definitely be considered. I think we’re trying to measure reliability, not knowing exactly what the best measure would be. And really it’s just a limitation when you’re looking at access controlled roadways like freeways. When looking at a signalized corridor you have a lot of what we call friction. Speed is a difficult measure to calculate. Ms. Terway accepted this friendly amendment to her friendly amendment.

Martha Fritzie proposed a friendly amendment to Mobility Policy 6: “Use mobility performance targets and thresholds for system planning and evaluating the impacts of plan amendments, such as including: Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita for home-based trips, ~~VMT/Employee for commute trips to/from work,~~ system completeness for all travel modes and travel speed and reliability.”

Asked for input on proposed amendment to Mobility Policy 6, Ms. Ellis noted it seems to back away from the work we have spent the last three years doing and defining the measures. I don’t feel it’s retractable, but I do have concerns about it and the message that it sends about the policy and the commitment behind the work that has been done. This is MTAC’s recommendation action, but yes, I’d support all but the proposed edits to Mobility Policy 6 (shown on screen).

Martha Fritzie felt the change was made because we’re really trying to add flexibility. And again, it goes to the list, if adding to make it inclusive. Ms. Ellis added the measures went through a very deliberate narrowing process to these 3 measures. We know we have further work on how to implement it. Sarah Paulus shared the same concern and would opt out of having this. That was agreed from Jacqui Treiger and Jean Senechal Biggs. Jessica Pelz agreed to retaining the word “including” in the friendly amendment.

Joseph Edge noted going back to make a pitch for retaining the work base: VMT/employee for commute trips to/from work. I think that's an important metric to continue to capture. And I think it should continue to be on including lists, and perhaps not limited but definitely including. This is a shadow VMT that we need to be capturing and we're not really capturing it now. There's a lot of missed data there around this particular metric, which we need to be tracking into the future. Tom Armstrong agreed. It was not understood why the employee commute trips are being singled out for deletion. This is what we've zeroed in on many years of work.

Jessica Pelz noted I think we shared some concerns about the VMT per employee based on a lot of home-based employee things that are happening now. Martha Fritzie noted I think that we just still don't really know enough about how the VMT will be implemented and we were intending this amendment to provide us more flexibility.

Tom Armstrong noted if it's an affirmative action to eliminate something from consideration, I think leaving it in there, as you know, we will continue to work on. Home based work trips are a fraction of the work trips now. The number of work from home all the time is probably less than 10%. We need to continue to call out that employee VMT commute trips as an important component of what is stressing our system. Sarah Paulus agreed. Taking it off the table completely right now doesn't make sense.

Martha Fritzie agreed to withdraw the proposed edits and keeping the original language to Mobility Policy 6. This was agreed by Jessica Pelz.

Discussion was closed. Chair Kehe called for a vote:

MOTION: To approve Metro staff recommendations with these revisions:

- Add new recommendation 3: “Strike sections 3.2.5.2 (Mobility policy system planning actions) and 3.2.5.3 (Mobility policy plan amendments evaluation actions) from RTP Chapter 3. “
- Update action 1.d as follows, “d. Define future analysis needed to determine an appropriate ~~throughway speed threshold~~ reliability metrics for signalized throughways and that this work will be completed in collaboration with affected jurisdictions and the Metro Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee as part of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan update (2024-25) and in coordination with the update to the Oregon Highway Plan (2023-24)”

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstaining: Laura Kelly.

Consent Item - Comment #345 previously pulled from consent bundle

MOTION: Proposed update recommendation for Comment #345 with underlined being added, as follows, “In 1995, the Metro Council adopted a long-range land use and transportation plan for the region. The 2040 Growth Concept was seen as visionary for its time but does not address topics such as racial equity and climate change, which have taken on increasing importance. In recent years, the Metro Council, local jurisdictions, and stakeholders have seen a need to update the Growth Concept, which is now approaching 30 years since adoption. In spring 2019, the Metro Council directed staff to proceed with implementation of a work program to refresh the Growth Concept. The work program focused on incorporating racial equity and climate change considerations into the region's long-term plans and expressed an intention to do so while maintaining an emphasis on compact growth and reinvestment in existing urban locations. With the emergence of the COVID pandemic in early 2020, the

Metro Council called for a pause on this work, pending future Council direction. In addition to topics such as racial equity and climate change, the 2040 refresh project should focus on the need to plan for complete transportation networks to support the emerging urban areas as well as support freight and employment uses throughout the region. Metro staff anticipates guidance from the Metro Council on a work program after the Council makes its urban growth management decision in late 2024.”

No discussion. Chair Kehe called for a vote:

Moved: Martha Fritzie

Seconded: Jessica Pelz

ACTION: Motion carried by majority. Opposed 2: Gery Keck and Joseph Edge. Abstaining: Brendon Haggerty.

Overall recommendation to MPAC on adoption of the 2023 RTP including consent items, discussion items, Ordinance No. 23-1496, and including its exhibits:

Exhibit A – 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (and appendices)

Exhibit B – Regional Framework Plan Amendments

Exhibit C – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes (Part 1 and Part 2)

Exhibit D – Findings of Compliance with Statewide Goals

Motion: To approve the overall recommendation to MPAC on adoption of the 2023 RTP as listed.

Moved: Jean Senechal Biggs

Seconded: Tom Armstrong

No discussion. Chair Kehe called for a vote.

ACTION: Motion approved unanimously.

2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy (Resolution No. 23-5348) Recommendation to MPAC (Ally

Holmqvist, Metro) Information was presented on recommendations for the 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy. Included were technical edits for standard terms, clarity & consistency, added language about additional transit tools, added language about HCT accessibility strategies, more detail and new sections on rapid bus implementation in Plan & Ch 8, new survey engagement summaries added to Appendix A, and standardized titles and added detail on bus lanes & feedback.

MOTION: To approve High Capacity Transit Strategy Resolution No. 23-5348 including Exhibit B – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes

Moved: Jean Senechal Biggs

Seconded: Joseph Edge

Discussion on the motion:

Martha Fritzie didn't have any particular changes to offer. I think it's fair to say Clackamas County has a number of concerns about this and several questions. One of the questions is why there's been an increase in corridors from the 2009 to 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy. I think it's pretty clear from the map that most of the priorities have moved away from the County with the County already lacking transit options. Looking at the map it also appears that in a lot of parts of the region the strategy doesn't create the possibility for a viable and complete HCT system in the foreseeable future. I don't know at this time we are supportive. I think there are still too many questions and concerns particularly about the lack of transit priority in Clackamas County.

Ms. Holmqvist noted we had actually had an opportunity to discuss this at the C4 subcommittee meeting this morning. And you are correct, the number of corridors in the 2023 HCT Strategy is more than in 2009. That largely because the 2009 plan was focused on light rail, which is generally a much higher cost investment than Rapid Bus. With Rapid Bus we have opportunities for that to be much less cost. So there was the opportunity to look at expanding the network.

And because HCT really is a tool that with the capital investment often is providing things like the larger buses and some the different features that provide more speed. And not always, although there is a policy framework for increasing frequency that it is an investment that really is taking frequent transit to the next level. Where we are seeing that frequent transit sort of bursting at the seams, overcrowding in buses, where the operations maybe aren't working as intended because they are the popular corridor in such a heavily traveled one that we're not seeing that speed and or reliability that really creates a trip comparable to driving.

Priority needs differ in locations, capacity in the system and frequency of service. Rapid Bus allows for more flexibility that what light rail provided in the past or HC investments just aren't the right tool or solution at this time. More information was provided on the priority with tiers. Ms. Fritzie appreciated the comments and looked forward to further discussion with concerns and questions going forward. There were no amendments to the motion.

Discussion was closed. Chair Kehe called for a vote:

MOTION: To approve High Capacity Transit Strategy Resolution No. 23-5348 including Exhibit B – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes

ACTION: Motion passed by majority. Two opposed: Martha Fritzie and Manny Contreras. No abstentions.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting October 18, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	10/18/2023	10/18/2023 MTAC Meeting Agenda	101823M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	10/11/2023	MTAC Work Program as of 10/11/2023	101823M-02
3	Minutes	September 20, 2023	Minutes from MTAC September 20, 2023 meeting	101823M-03
4	Memo	10/11/2023	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: Adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Ordinance No. 23-1496: MTAC RECOMMENDATION TO MPAC REQUESTED	101823M-04
5	Attachment 1	10/18/2023	Potential Changes to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496 as Shared by TPAC and MTAC members on Oct. 11, 2023	101823M-05
6	Attachment 2	N/A	Key Dates for Finalizing the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan and 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy for Adoption	101823M-06
7	ORDINANCE NO. 23-1496	N/A	ORDINANCE NO. 23-1496 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2018 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) TO COMPLY WITH FEDERAL AND STATE LAW AND AMENDING THE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN	101823M-07
8	Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 23-1496	July 10, 2023	Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 23-1496 PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	101823M-08
9	Exhibit B to Ordinance No. 23-1496	N/A	Exhibit B to Ordinance No. 23-1496 Chapter 2 Regional Framework Plan	101823M-09
10	Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	September 29, 2023	Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496 Key policy topics for discussion to address for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan and beyond	101823M-10
11	Attachment 1 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	N/A	Attachment 1 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496 Key JPACT and Metro Council discussions and actions on ODOT projects in the greater Portland area undergoing the NEPA process	101823M-11
12	Attachment 2 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	9/25/2023	Attachment 2 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496 ODOT Projects Adopted in 2024-27 MTIP and 2024-27 STIP with RTP ID 12095	101823M-12
13	Part 2 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	9/29/2023	Part 2 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496: Consent Items	101823M-13

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
14	Memo	10/11/2023	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy Adoption	101823M-14
15	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348	N/A	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2023 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STRATEGY	101823M-15
16	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 23-5348	July 10, 2023	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 23-5348 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT Strategy PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT	101823M-16
17	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23-5348	9/29/2023	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23-5348 2023 HCT Strategy Summary of Comments and Recommended Actions	101823M-17
18	Staff Report to Resolution No. 23-5348	9/27/2023	Staff Report IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348 ADOPTING THE 2023 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STRATEGY	101823M-18
19	Presentation	10/18/2023	Adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan MTAC RECOMMENDATION TO MPAC REQUESTED	101823M-19
20	Presentation	10/18/2023	HCT Strategy Adoption	101823M-20