

# COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #17

## HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #17 Summary

Date and Time: April 28, 2022, 3:00-6:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

## WELCOME AND OUTCOMES

Ed Washington, CAG co-chair, welcomed the group to the day's meeting. Lisa Keohokalole Schauer, CAG Co-Facilitator, reviewed the technical instructions for the meeting. Ed then reviewed the meeting's agenda.

Prior to the program update, CAG Member Tom Gentry read a statement he had prepared sharing his opinions on census data and how it relates to the program.

## PROGRAM UPDATE

Greg provided an update on the overall program. The program is continuing the process of filtering design options to a singular recommendation that will be taken next week to the Executive Steering Group (ESG). He then shared information about the one transit option investment was presented at the ESG presentation last week. He explained that this was done because the IBR team, partners, and the transit entities have all agreed that light rail is the transit option that should move forward as the recommended, and they do not want to perpetuate a false narrative that the Program is looking at other alternatives. Greg reassured the group that all the issues brought by this group and others have been considered, including equity, cost, and impacts to other communities.

Greg then shared slides with the group regarding what factors were considered and how the recommendation on the transit investment was made.

## Question and Answer

Prior to the question and answer, Lisa reminded the group of their commitment to respect each other and the CAG operating norms of putting relationships first.

CAG Member: My first comment is on the previous discussion you just alluded to. I think there is a way to have our members concerns alleviated or explained a little more carefully. So, what I will do is offer to the group, Sam, to Greg and anyone else who was dealing with this specific issue, and Tom as well, my research team at the Coalition of Communities of Color to walk everyone through what “category” means and how the Census Bureau comes up with those categories. This is not the time for that, but I wanted to offer that up to anyone who is interested. I have two Ph.D. researchers on staff who deal with this data every day and can walk through the data.

Lisa: that is fantastic. Thank you so much, I really appreciate that. I think that will help bridge the conversation in the right direction. I will take you up on that. Greg and the Equity Team have been analyzing this data and have been careful about what we get from the Census vs the information we are using on the program. Greg, anything to add?

Greg: I appreciate that offer and I think that is a very valuable conversation we need to have.

Lisa: we will also extend that invite to everyone on the CAG, so you have the opportunity to be involved in that as well.

CAG Member: I echo Marcus, we have a lot of those conversation here on this side of the river through the NAACP and are happy to help lend a hand for those critical conversations. I also want to speak on the pieces of information we have received over the last couple of days. More importantly, really understanding the transit. As a blanket statement, my organization (NAACP) and myself, on a personal and professional level, are supportive of a) rectifying this bridge and b) love the idea of light rail coming into Clark County and we appreciate the City of Vancouver’s efforts. We’ve been in this setting for about two years on Zoom and I think it would be really appreciated, and I think our partners at other orgs would be supportive as well, of actually going out to really experience the things we have been talking about. Specifically, the pieces that Greg just explained. I think it would be really powerful and impactful for us to schedule some time, hop on some BRT, bus, whatever, and go out there and experience what we’re talking about. As a lifelong Clark County resident I understand it to a different degree but for the Portland folks we’re only 20 minutes away, depending on the time and that bridge. I am sure you have some experience but I don’t think you have the full experience and I think this is a cool opportunity for CAG and maybe the EAG, to come together, hop on some busses and see what we’re all talking about here. Maybe a conversation after, bring in some lunch or something, but go out there, and then have some dialogue to hash out the things we’re questioning.

Greg: I think that is a great idea. We get much better understanding when we experience stuff in person. We will endeavor to create such an opportunity. We have been talking about getting folks together to walk the bridge, to experience Hayden Island, look at Evergreen, at the waterfront; to look at all of these things that, up to this point, have just been lines on paper or words spoken. I appreciate

you bringing that up and I think it is a valuable opportunity for folks to see some of the work that has been done and have in-depth conversations on the context.

CAG Member: I'm happy to help coordinate to make that happen, so thank you.

Lisa: if our operating norm is to put relationships first and we haven't had the opportunity to be beyond a screen, and we're talking about building a bridge which is not just concrete and steel, but about building understanding, this is a great opportunity.

CAG Member: Jasmine, any time you want to ride the MAX or C-TRAN, I am right there with you. I think it is the experimental thing that will get us to see the context in a much better light. I want to echo what Marcus has been talking about. This will not be the first and only disagreement. We will have others and it's not a bad thing. I felt that Tom was trying to make some good points, this was just not the appropriate time or place for that. We could, as Marcus suggested, have a workshop or work group to detail and I would like to participate in that as well. That's a great idea but it should be offline so that we can proceed with the business of IBR.

CAG Member: I am wondering how you handle comments that disagree with your LPA, specifically from agencies or individuals who have some authority. I am looking at the comment from the Coast Guard and from Congresswoman Jaime Herrera Beutler. Both of them have come out in criticism of some of the parts of bridge and I want to know how you are handling that.

Greg: we have a meeting with the Coast Guard later in May. We have seen the comments from the Coast Guard. We have been doing river surveys, we know that we have to get a permit from the Coast Guard that will dictate the bridge height. That is an ongoing conversation. It involves answering questions such as, what can we mitigate for users who have a need for more than 116 ft. Will the future needs of users of the river, exceed 116 ft? Those are key questions that we will be discussing with the coast guard. We had a permit the last go around that agreed on a clearance of 116 ft, but that permit is no longer applicable. We are looking forward to having that conversation.

As far as Congresswoman Herrera Beutler, we had a very good and respectful conversation with her. She has a definite viewpoint on transit and commuters that go across this bridge. We take her input very seriously. We worked very quickly to respond to her concerns and questions regarding issues of crime related to transit, whether it's related to usage of transit. We have been working with her office to make sure she has the information she needs regarding how we came to this recommendation. Some of the slides you saw earlier were presented to the congresswoman to assure her that this was not something pulled out of the air or a repeat from CRC. It was a full analysis of what the needs are, what the current conditions are, what partners feel is appropriate, and what the community feels is appropriate to cross this river. We hear them, we're not going to have 100% perfect agreement with

everyone who has a voice in this, as evidenced by the earlier conversation. But we will address the concerns and will let folks know in a very transparent way how we got to where we are.

CAG Member: as we were beginning to talk about this and along the way it was mentioned that we need to plan for a 100-year bridge. It seems to me that the information you provided has a 10, 15, maybe 20 year look at transit, terminus, number of lanes, modes, and those sort of things. Have you been looking further forward? I'm wondering what sort of things have been thought about for the longer term.

Greg: right now we know that we need to make this a multimodal corridor to provide options for people to move through the corridor. Our best projections take us out to 2045 and say that the highway mode cannot be the sole provider of movement of people through the corridor. We know we have to have high-capacity transit (HCT) that can supplement and take some vehicles off the roadway. We also know that technology is changing. As we look at fossil fuel burning vehicles, we may have electric cars or hydrogen powered cars that produce no emissions. Those are things our models can only guess but right now there are 143,000 people per day and the region is growing. We cannot build highways wide enough to accommodate only one mode of transportation. So, our model is our best guess of what we can get. The model that we use is not IBR's. It is a model that Metro and the SW Washington RTC have put together. We give them inputs, they run the model, and give us the best guess what it means for the future. This considers land use, population density, population growth and other things. We don't have a crystal ball, but we do have this tool and it is the best thing we have to project the needs 20 years in the future. We might get to the point where we have the flying cars that the Jetsons predicted. All of these things are our best guess on how we can have a future that this bridge can provide. One thing we do know is that humankind has been crossing rivers for years and we've always had a need to cross rivers. It might be human curiosity it might be trade. But we know this river will need to be crossed in numerous different ways.

CAG Member: when we are talking about crossing rivers and trade, we cannot forget that freight needs are integral to this section of freeway. This is a major economic route between Mexico and Canada and there is a tremendous amount of freight that moves through this area. We need to have pavement to run the trucks on. Those needs are growing exponentially. We are not just building for today but building for the future.

Greg: understood, thank you. We just had a good conversation with our partners at the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and they stressed the very same point. As we look at how people move in this region, it is a highway of national significance, and we cannot forget that goods and services move through the interstate system. We have to recognize the national and international purpose of this freeway. So, we hear you.

CAG Member: thank you. Hopefully it will transition into a capacity conversation at some point.

CAG Member: tagging onto the freight conversation, while there is significant freight moving on the bridge itself, there is also a significant amount of freight moving under the bridge and we want to make sure we have capacity to maintain the federal navigation channel and maintain it all the way inland to Lewiston, Idaho. Looking at capacity for the future, as a potential high, wide, and heavy corridor, we want to make sure we are not putting in an artificial bottle neck for the future that will prevent large pieces of infrastructure that may or may not need to travel under the bridge and we are not restricting our ability to have a high, wide, and heavy channel for the future or restricting that channels current usage and any freight capacity that needs to move in the future as well.

Greg: this goes back to the conversation about bridge height and the type of bridge.

CAG member: Height is not our current challenge, its width that we are currently struggling with.

Greg: we are hoping that a new modern bridge will solve the width problem. There will be fewer piers in the water and the channel itself. Hopefully we will be looking at straightening out some of the movement that comes through the corridor via water but it is complex thing. The height restrictions due to Pearson Airfield and PDX are real. We know that the aviation administration will not allow us to build towers that pierce into that upper boundary, but we also know we cannot build low enough where we cannot get future large loads through, and we cannot mitigate for those loads. It's like threading a very narrow needle to get to a solution but we are working on it with the Coast Guard.

Greg shared the next steps now that the preferred transit investment has been identified.

Katherine Kelly, City of Vancouver, reiterated the idea that the on the ground experience, going across the bridge, riding the Vine, really understanding the context of Vancouver overall is very important and she offered to help coordinate as needed.

Patrick Sweeney, City of Portland, added that the way Transit interacts with Hayden Island is of key interest to the neighborhood, businesses, property owners, the City of Portland and TriMet. It's a fantastic opportunity to rethink how people get to and from the island. Changing access on the island for walking, biking, vehicle, and transit options are fantastic elements that he looks forward to working with the IBR team on. They want to make sure the changes are done right as Hayden Island is the only Island community on the Columbia River.

## RAMP TO RAMP CONNECTIONS

Ryan LeProwse, Transportation Planning Lead, reviewed what auxiliary lanes are and how they function. He then presented analysis on them that was completed by IBR staff.

CAG Member: this is the no build correct?

Ryan: this is the 2045 no-build, correct.

CAG Member: so, the congestion I am seeing south of the bridge, does that assume there are no improvements in the Rose Quarter?

Ryan: this assumes there are improvements in the Rose Quarter area. The rose quarter is more of a p.m. problem. If you see where I-84 is, it clears up a bit but there is still a bottleneck at the I-5/I-405 split.

CAG Member: I am a little disappointed looking at this chart and the other two, that the footprint of the no-build is given as not applicable. The other two are in comparison to CRC and the no-build has a comparison to the CRC and I would like to know what that is. How much is the CRC an expansion over the current bridge?

Ryan: this is just focusing on the bridge, Tom, so we can track that number down for you as there will be a different width, but I'll get back to you. This is mostly looking at transportation related impacts and comparisons, so it's just focused on that scale.

CAG Member: I'm just interested in that question to see how it impacts Hayden Island, but I think it would be useful for the whole project.

Ryan: that should have been covered in the Hayden Island/Marine Drive section. This presentation is focused on transportation and auxiliary lanes.

CAG Member: it was not. It was actually turned away when I asked before as something that hadn't been analyzed.

Ryan: we will work with our team to get back to you on that.

CAG Member: under travel time you have Hwy 99 to victory boulevard, but I don't see the Hwy 99 on either of the maps you have shown. Is it the same as main street?

Ryan: it is not, it is up Salmon Creek, 179<sup>th</sup> street.

CAG Member: I have the same question about Broadway, I assume you mean Broadway in Portland

Ryan: yes, Broadway/Widler Avenue.

CAG Member: I'm sorry I'm not familiar with this as maybe some other people but Broadway in Portland is South on I-84?

Ryan: it is just north of I-84. Right by the rose garden and Moda Center.

Greg: before you leave this slide, we had some other comments outside this meeting regarding the footnote at the bottom about daily mode share. Could you walk us through what that footnote means? Folks were questioning if we are building constraints into the transit mode with this project.

Ryan: that footnote is talking about transit demand. Transit demand exceeds the capacity of the proposed system, so we are looking at the mode share of the capacity. We have summarized that information and documented it so folks can understand what the data is showing. There are future transit optimization opportunities to try and get into some of those facts. Every transit option is over the future planned capacity within the 2045 time period.

CAG Member: I had a question about the tolling piece, more so about the function. Between the two Department of Transportation's, will there be a coordinated effort through their traffic management centers to run signage for that tolling? To run algorithms to work through the tolling rates based on the time of day? In terms of community outreach, advertising and making sure it is a smooth rollout in terms of what tolling looks like and how it pays for things.

Greg: the tolling question is an interesting one. The IBR team recognizes that, to help pay for the bridge there will have to be tolls. We have agreed on variable rate tolling as that mechanism. Toll rates will be set together by the legislature and transportation commissions in each state. We know that we will need tolls to complete the funding picture of this bridge and we have agreed with all the partners that it should be variable rate tolls to maximize those funds and to start looking at how traffic moves through this corridor.

Ryan: on transportation system management, we will be working with the two transportation commissions, ODOT and WSDOT. Giving people information is absolutely apart of the process.

CAG Member: I also want to ask on the back-office work to make sure it runs smoothly - you're probably going to have call centers on both sides of the river? Making sure those call centers are in places where there is economic need in terms of work and things like that is also a priority.

Greg: we are looking at equity issues concerning tolling, we are doing national outreach to see what the best equitable practices are. One of the reasons ODOT was chosen to operate tolling for IBR is they will be more local than being head quartered in the Puget Sound area where WSDOT's existing tolling

capacity exist. So, all the questions about the fairness and customer service issues related to tolling we are put under the umbrella of equity and ensuring those issues are transmitted to the toll rate setting authorities.

CAG Member: thank you and I think we have a real opportunity to solidify the low-income portion of that, that's not seen in other parts. Thank you.

CAG Member: this travel time is in minutes for the bridge crossing areas. Is there also going to be information available on the impacts of the different build vs no build for people who are south of Victory Boulevard?

Ryan: yes, we have that travel time information. This is just a few locations summarized, giving the larger picture.

CAG Member: what I mean is, is it the expectation that any of these options will impact transit south of Victory Boulevard or is it negligible? Take rose quarter for example, will there be changes in travel time depending on the different types of bridge configurations?

Ryan: this is just a few locations. We have travel times all the way from I-205 to the Rose Quarter. This is just two locations we picked but we can get that information to you.

CAG Member: could you explain why the PM peak reduces so much for the two auxiliary lane alternative but not for the one?

Ryan: it comes down to lane volumes and lane balance because the interchanges are closely spaced. We don't have the volumes today, but I showed two weeks ago how those heavy ramps at Marine Drive and the Interstate are adding up. It comes down to flow and volume coming across. This sort of cleans up those bottle necks, with the one you still kind of have a bottle neck which is why the travel time is different for each scenario.

CAG Member: does this means that there is more traffic that comes in and goes out within our project, so with the auxiliary lanes, those drivers don't need to get on the main part of the freeway?

Ryan: that's a very good summary, yes. Based on the origin and destination presentation, 75-85% of people get on and/or off on these ramps so there is a lot of interaction with these ramps north and south of the river.

CAG Member: regardless of how many lanes we have, south bound (SB) AM seems to be unaffected, or at least not as much as SB PM or north bound (NB) am or NB PM. Those all show significant differences based on how

many aux lanes you add. SB AM is consistently congested regardless, what does it take to have the same impact in reduction on congestion?

Ryan: the bottleneck downstream is kind of constraining and backing up, engulfing the program area making it difficult to tell whether there is or isn't a bottleneck at the bridge the 1 aux and 2 aux scenarios. There are potential transportation system management or transportation demand management solutions. It's getting to that split, it's another bottleneck that is outside our program area, maybe ODOT will try and address that in the future.

CAG Member: summarizing what you just said, no number of auxiliary lanes, even if you had 5, would help the congestion in the AM SB?

Ryan: south of the project area or within the project area?

CAG Member: just within the project area. Congestion is caused by what is downstream is what you said.

Ryan: there is a downstream bottle neck but there is a bottle neck at the bridge too that we are trying to address. There is a redline that comes off the bridge in the no build that we are addressing.

CAG Member: I'm curious if the projections factor in folks who may want to avoid the program area to avoid paying a toll.

Ryan: sorry I didn't get too into that, but the forecast does look at I-5 and I-205 flows, including tolling and mode changes with the tolls. Tolls vary by time of day, a little higher in the peak periods. Travelers don't do discretionary trips in the peak periods if they can avoid it, so yes that is accounted for in the forecasting.

## Breakout Groups

The group split into four breakout groups to discuss the information Ryan provided. Due to time constraints, upon returning key take-aways were shared rather than a full report out.

Lynn Valenter, CAG Co-Chair, shared that her group thought the number of auxiliary lanes seems like a no-brainer because having two relieves the most congestion and that's the primary goal. The group then discussed if the decision had already been made and does it matter what CAG members think? In other venues, participants had heard that the decision for one auxiliary lane had already been made, which is not just about this issue, but also others.

Audri Bomar, IBR Communications Lead, shared that her group noted that one lane seems to address the priorities and needs given there will also be transit. Future capacity needs will be able to utilize multiple options of travel, both active and transit. Her group discussed that multiple auxiliary lanes can be confusing to use so the added benefit of more auxiliary lanes would need to be coupled with education on how to use them. The group discussed their priorities, including property impacts. Staff explained that the property impacts do not differ between 1 and 2 auxiliary lanes. Congestion and safety were also noted as top priorities and auxiliary lanes address both.

Tom Hickey, CAG Member, added that his group touched on how the data suggests the more aux lanes the better. But there were concerns about the value of “do no farther harm” in terms of keeping the footprint to a minimum and it seems like there were concerns from the Cowlitz tribe of additional auxiliary lanes doing damage to cultural resources. The group also discussed how the freight community wants to see congestion kept to a minimum and anything that can be done to improve the flow of traffic is of value to the freight community, and to the North Portland neighborhoods.

Lynn added that her group also dug into the question of why SB AM peaks can’t be decreased but they also understand it is outside of the scope of the project, but they continued to discuss it.

Jason Hagen, IBR CAG Administrator, hit on safety and how auxiliary lanes definitely increase safety. They also discussed the SB AM peak congestion and education on how to use aux lanes. At the end they discussed one versus two and seemed to have more people in favor of two auxiliary lanes.

## MODIFIED LPA COMPONENT CAG FEEDBACK OVERVIEW

Lisa shared how the IBR team has worked to appropriately summarize all the feedback from the CAG and provide it in a summary document. The document is not meant to be a consensus document, but one that can be referenced by Lynn and Ed in ESG meetings. She opened the floor for CAG members to give their feedback on the two-page document.

CAG Member: these are not in priority order, correct?

Lynn: no.

CAG Member: I have been hearing from other sources completely different statistics on the number of people who are or will ride transit and the type of transit they will ride. This point in here on the “data behind the conclusion”, I really want to see more of that. I find myself sometimes talking to others not involved and having them site statistics opposite from the ones I’ve heard.

Greg: the model we use is owned by Metro and the RTC. We give them inputs and they tell us the projected ridership based on a number of factors in their models. Folks can disagree, it's not a crystal ball, but it is the best tool that we have and has been certified by the FTA as a very good model. I don't know where other folks are getting information, but you can send them to us, you can send them to Metro or RTC and we can try to rectify what they are saying with what we are saying.

Lynn: if someone has data, forward that to the project team. Everyone wants to build the best possible bridge, and it's more helpful if we can capture those who think there is a conflict in the FAQs or something instead of them just thinking our data is flawed. Maybe there is an explanation, maybe there's not.

Ed Washington, CAG Co-Facilitator: I want to make sure that the information we are asking you to share so that we can share it with the larger community. It is very important that we can share with them what your thoughts and needs are. Sometimes we tend to think things are not a good idea, but I don't think you all will be pushing bad ideas. I want to make sure Lynn and I are getting your input so we can be reflective of your wants and needs. Our job is to serve as a conduit on your behalf.

Lynn: thank you, Ed. Does anyone have anything to add or change in regard to transit? I wonder if we don't add in here that we have been advised that the terminus and mode has been decided upon.

CAG Member: if there is transfer, if I have to go from vine, to metro, to max and so forth, I think it's important that I don't have to have multiple transit cards. I want to be sure it's a regional payment and I don't have to keep multiple accounts.

CAG Member: I know you only need one card now and I imagine that would be the same in the future.

CAG Member: in the March 24<sup>th</sup> LRT/BRT section, one thing I heard in conversation that day, and after, from people, particularly the low income and POC, is that they be held harmless as far as the time of transit. Where this seems to be barreling to is a combo of LRT and BRT. The ones who are least flexible should not be the ones spending the most amount of time getting from point A to B. In any of the estimations, if we can look at, as I've heard some of the ESG members say, "I'm more agnostic as long as people get to where they need to go." Despite being agnostic, is it equal time or convenience or inconvenience? So, I would like to know what the estimates say – if they are plus or minus the same or if the mode would take x% additional time.

Lynn: if I can just ask a clarifying question, when you began, I thought you we're talking about time of day for low income but that isn't what I heard.

CAG Member: no, I wasn't talking about time of day, I was talking about actual mode and actual travel time it takes to get from start to finish. Though the hinterlands, and a lot of things, the frequency overnight, there becomes fewer options in the end of the day or the beginning of the day.

CAG Member: could someone expand on the bullet point on "LRT should be there in the future, build it now." What was the intention behind that bullet?

Jason: I can help with that. The comment was "build for the future". So, if it wasn't decided now but in 30 or 40 years that LRT was needed, it will be tougher to put track on an existing bridge to avoid a second construction after the bridge is built.

Greg: while we have this up, I want to speak to the park and ride bullet. We know that both communities, the city, and I hope Katherine is still on to talk about the undesirability to have these large park and rides in the downtown core of Vancouver, the City of Portland that has eliminated or limited the number of park and rides in their downtown corridor. So, this is an issue that will continue to be a discussion going forward, how do we maximize transit without having these large park and rides that are taking up valuable space in the downtown corridor. I just want to let the group know those discussions are ongoing.

Katherine: that is absolutely right, we have implemented land use policies and plans in the core of downtown over the past decade. Looking to the future, we don't have a vision of having large parking garages on that valuable land.

Lynn: given that insight, if there is anything people want to add to these bullets that would be appropriate.

CAG Member: I am curious if there has been any consideration with the Vancouver VA and perhaps federal land offering park and ride opportunities? Because I know there is a bus that will take people from the Vancouver VA to the Portland VA, and I am wondering if that has been considered especially as we look at that Evergreen campus area being a hub for our transit.

Greg: I know our team has not had that level of conversation but it's a great point as look at how we can drive Transit use going into the future, looking at opportunities like that.

CAG Member: I'm curious if with the policy the City of Portland has brought to the table, if there has been an analysis of ridership usage without the availability of park and rides? Will that impact, how can the transit facilities even be used?

Katherine: I'm with the City of Vancouver so I was speaking on behalf of the City of Vancouver, and, with this investment, we realize we will need to have some parking to support this transit. That is something we are looking at where potential locations are in coordination with where the transit station will be located. I am not saying there will be no park and ride parking provided, but we do not want large park and ride structures taking up valuable transit-oriented development that could be used otherwise to support the variety of activities we do want downtown.

CAG Member: thank you Katherine, and I apologize for having the wrong metropolitan area in mind. I was wondering if there is correlation between those facilities and usage of transit.

Katherine: that's a very good question with a fine balance. Balancing our vision for downtown and the need for transit parking if we are to have a transit hub. In design phase, we will be having a lot of conversations about that.

CAG Member: since federal funding has been saying we need a light rail system, maybe federal properties for park and rides are a good idea. We can say if you're pushing us to do LRT, we need you to help support it.

Greg: they are different federal agencies, but the question will get posed as to how different destinations can be utilized to get folks where they need to go.

Lisa: thank you everyone. I realize this document does not include the feedback on auxiliary lanes. Jason, we can have that added and then sent back out to CAG for their feedback.

Jason: absolutely. Please keep a look out on that and I will put a deadline on that for feedback so that Ed and Lynn can have the two pager with plenty of time before the ESG.

## WHAT'S NEXT, PUBLIC COMMENT

Lisa reviewed the upcoming topics for the CAG and the upcoming meetings for all groups, including the ESG on May 5<sup>th</sup> from 7:30-9:30 a.m. and the Bi-State Legislative Committee on May 6<sup>th</sup> from 9:00-12:00 p.m.

### Public Comment

8847: Hello! My name is Justin, I live in Vancouver, Washington just on the other side of 4<sup>th</sup> plain and I was just curious about the light rail transit that is going to be coming over. Where will it be ending? And is it into Vancouver for people living in Vancouver? If people are going to have to drive to a park and ride and then pay for light rail it's going to be an inconvenience. Why wouldn't people just drive over the bridge? I'm not trying

to be negative, but it must be streamlined and convenient for people to want to use it. And then the other thing with tolling, how do people pay the tolling without making it a bottle neck? How does that work?

Lisa: thank you Justin, those are good questions. We don't have all the answers right now. In terms of your question on the terminus of light rail, that hasn't been completely decided and is still in process. Same for the tolling and park and rides. We can follow up if you want to send an email to [info@interstatebridge.org](mailto:info@interstatebridge.org). We can provide you with some information and point you to the information on the website. Thank you for providing public comment.

## WRAP UP AND THANK YOU

Greg thanked everyone for their participation. He said that this is what being a part of a democracy is about, having the community voices be heard.

Ed thanked everyone for taking the time to be present and active participants today. He also thanked Lynn for her good work on this committee.

The meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

## MEETING PARTICIPANTS

### CAG Members or Alternatives

Attendees	Organization
Andrew Hoan	Portland Business Alliance
Ashton Simpson	Oregon Walks
Dena Horton	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Bill Prows	Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs
Ed Washington	Co-Chair
Irina Phillips	At-Large Community Member
Jana Jarvis	OR Trucking Association
Jasmine Tolbert	Vancouver NAACP
Javier Navarro	At-Large Community Member
Lynn Valenter	Co-Chair
Marcus Mundy	Coalition for Communities of Color
Martha Wiley	WA Transit Representative
Michael A. Martin-Tellis	Vancouver Neighborhood Association

Michael Kelly	Human Services Council
Mikaela Williams	At-Large Community Member
Sam Kim	At-Large Community Member
Sarah Hall	At-Large Community Member
Sheri Call	WA Trucking Association
Thomas W. Gentry	At-Large Community Member
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Whitney Mosback	Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Miriam Halliday	Workforce Southwest Washington

### Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Organization
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Ryan LeProwse	IBR Transportation Planning Lead
Audri Bomar	IBR Communications Lead
Jake Warr	IBR Equity team
Jason Hagen	IBR Community Advisory Group Administrator
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator

### Additional Participants

54 members of the public, partner agency staff, and the IBR Team viewed the meeting via the Zoom webinar and the YouTube livestream during the meeting.

## MEETING RECORDING AND MATERIALS

### Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available [here](#).

### Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available [here](#).