

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #14

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #14 Summary

Date and Time: March 10, 2022, 4:00-6:00 pm

Location: Zoom Webinar and YouTube Livestream

WELCOME AND OUTCOMES

Johnell Bell, CAG co-facilitator, welcomed the group and reviewed the technical instructions for the meeting. Ed Washington, CAG co-chair, reviewed the agenda.

DRAFT MODIFIED LPA

Greg Johnson, IBR's Program Administrator, provided a program update. He began by discussing how the Washington Legislature is looking at putting \$1 billion in construction funding towards IBR. It is not finalized until the Governor signs, but the program is waiting with great anticipation. Last week, some of the program's leadership was in Washington D.C. to talk with the US Department of Transportation (DOT) about program milestones and federal grant programs to meet the funding needs for the program. It was a very fruitful discussion, and they seem very in tune with what is needed in this area. The program has also been having conversations with congressional offices and so far, they have been very supportive of getting this Program done.

Greg then shared a presentation on what the "Draft Modified Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)" is. He reviewed the three major components that the CAG will discuss and provide feedback on in the LPA: Hayden Island/Marine Drive interchanges, number of auxiliary lanes, and transit mode. He also discussed the CAG's role in creating the draft modified LPA.

CAG Q&A AND OPEN DISCUSSION

CAG Member: As we spent a tremendous amount of time working together, the ESG sending recommendations to the bi-state legislature, going through a whole other supplemental EIS process which has a whole series of public meetings and public engagement, how will the feedback from the public at that point be used when we've already spent an inordinate amount of time coming up with a solution that works.

Greg: That's a great question. This part of the program defines the stadium that we're in. The next part of the project, if you're okay using a baseball analogy, defines where the foul lines, home base, second, and third base are. So, we will be getting more into the detail of impacts. But where we are now is defining the area where we will play, and the next steps will be refining and diving down deeper. But we will have the pillars of the program defined.

CAG Member: In your visit with the federal delegations from Oregon and Washington, when you say they're supportive, did they have any major concerns that you can share and were there differences between Washington and Oregon delegations?

Greg: There was concern in regard to tolling, the impact it will have to both areas and ensuring it is done in an equitable way. We also heard that this is once in a generation timing where the stars are aligning for funding from Washington D.C., and we don't know what that may look like 2 to 4 years from now. The common sentiment was to strike now while the iron is hot.

CAG Member: Between the construction and program ultimately being done, what will happen to the existing traffic and bridge? Will the impact during the construction, for however many years, result in there being just a single span for traffic?

Greg: How we maintain traffic will be key to how we ensure the economy of this area continues to function in a reasonable way. We've talked about building new bridge spans west of the existing bridge and shifting traffic as appropriate so we can build other things. We think it will take, for the entire project, 6 or 7 years starting in 2025 and ending in 2031 or 32. We aim to keep 3 lanes in each direction during peak times.

CAG Member: Will transit go to Clark College and has a decision been made about that?

Greg: A final decision on the termini for high-capacity transit has not been decided yet. The equity analysis is one piece of the puzzle there are other factors such as impacts and costs, and we are hoping to have a decision or recommendation ready for this group by the end of this month. We are currently narrowing the transit options, as we believe some are not feasible anymore. I want to remind everyone, that there is no perfect solution, the goal is a final product that is acceptable to the entire region as we cannot afford to let the program fail again.

CAG Member: Before the next meeting, can we get a list of what we have to do? Including the things, we have to get done as we think of other alternatives.

Greg: We can definitely do that. I will work with our co-chairs and Jason to make sure you all have a clear understanding of what is going to be asked of you. We are going to ask you to weigh in on the recommendation put forth by our team for high-capacity transit mode, the number of auxiliary lanes, and on the Hayden Island Interchanges. Those are the three basic pillars we will be looking for your advice on.

Lynn: Just to clarify, that is the short term. There may be other elements, but the run to April 28th is those three items.

CAG Member: What are the required elements for this project? Such as transit.

Greg: No matter the scenario, we will have a very high capacity, active transportation facility built. As we go into the supplemental EIS, we will nail down more details. But it is not something you will have to say yay or nay to as it is a given. As we go forward into July, we will be going into more details and asking you all to look at those. What connections need to be made, what gaps need to be filled, etc.

CAG Member: What about the bridge design? How is that process being handled? Is there another advisory group that will be key in the design of the bridge?

Greg: The aesthetics side of it is something we will be asking the CAG to weigh in on in the future. Something that is becoming very technical is how the bridge will be situated; will it be side by side or stacked. We would love to turn that issue to you guys, but it has some technical ramifications in how it ties into interchanges or interacts with properties. Once this analysis is done, we will be presenting it to you. You will get to weigh in on the bridge type and aesthetics.

CAG TRANSIT BREAKOUT SESSION

Lisa Keohokalole Schauer, CAG co-facilitator, shared that given how technical the previous session was and the update that Greg just delivered, the group now wants to transition to a breakout session to spend time talking about what you heard at the last meeting regarding transit investments.

Breakout questions:

- Which of the CAG Values & Priorities should be emphasized as transit recommendations are identified?
- What aspects of the transit investment best align with the CAG Values & priorities?

Group 1 Debrief

Salome Chimuku, IBR equity and community engagement, shared that her group focused on the values and priorities of the project and how they are intersectional and dependent on one another. Especially when thinking about values and priorities as a lens for transit investment, there are many elements that need to be considered. Some of those are around equity with transit investments. Her group discussed the need to be considering those who are differently abled when thinking about equitable investments in transit. The group also discussed how to not lose the equity focus with transit, as cost and congestion can easily overshadow equity if it's not one of the top three priorities. They also discussed how mass transit can be a way to meet all needs, priorities, and values. The group discussed the need for and importance of informed, data driven decision making and how that is something that will need to be very transparent and looked at in context, not in a vacuum. The group discussed how all the data needs to be available, put into context, and fact checkable. Congestion and all modes of transportation are one in the same. As the program pushes forward, equity needs to remain centered in making decisions alongside the values and priorities.

Group 2 Debrief

Jake Warr, IBR equity lead, shared how the group started by talking about how, under the values and priorities, "congestion" is not the priority but "congestion relief" is. There was overlap with the first group in discussing the importance of data driven decisions and how the IBR staff is probably airing on the side of not sharing enough data, especially around major decisions. The group also discussed the importance of the transit options being efficient and attractive to folks, including those from North Clark County, utilizing a park and ride and maybe working during their transit ride and how transfers impact the efficiency and attractiveness. One question that came up was if there are differences between BRT and LRT in terms of the seismic resiliency of the bridge. The group also talked about climate change and the importance of that value and priority.

A CAG Member commented that they also overlapped with Salome in the discussion of the importance of equity and ensuring the solution works for all people.

Group 3 Debrief

Jason Hagen, IBR communications, shared that his group began with a conversation on need for data driven decisions and the need for the program to continue collecting and asking questions about the data even after the LPA is created. The next topic discussed was bi-state cooperation and how that was an issue that froze the previous planning effort. In addition, how bi-state cooperation needs to be from the city level all the way to the federal congressional level. Jason pointed out how the 12 values and priorities are listed in importance

based on how the group ranked them back in January and the third most important one ranked is data driven decisions. The group also discussed the mode of transit and if it has to be just one. Kelly Betteridge, IBR transit team, commented that essentially the group was saying that as we continue to think about this investment it's with the lens of how to utilize the existing system and create synergies to the built environment and investment. Rebecca Kennedy, City of Vancouver, shared that from the city's perspective, they want to find an option that supports connecting people to the greatest number of destinations possible. Jason shared how the group discussed building an option for the future and considering options that do not yet exist. The final topic was around increasing the bike and pedestrian access on and off the bridge.

CAG Member added that it was very helpful to have Rebecca there to help clarify things so thank you Rebecca for taking the time to be here.

Group 4 Debrief

Lisa shared that many of the topics already discussed were echoed in her group. One of the topics they discussed that has not yet been shared is what community values and priorities are and what they mean. For example, congestion, how will it be measured so that the LPA meets the litmus test for that value? Another key topic was the impacts of freight and how freight works within the system. The group also discussed what a larger footprint means for the cultural and historic impacts, both on land and in the river. The cultural and historical impacts are a key piece of centering equity and isn't something we've gotten into yet.

CAG Member asked how will the bridge and what we do impact transit and traffic on I-205? What synergies are there if we push people to that bridge? I had heard that the center lane where people walk and ride on I-205 was originally designed to have transit on it.

- Lynn Valenter: I wasn't in your group, but I've been attending the listening sessions with the various tribal groups and the profound impact the river has had on them and what it means to them is very clear. I am very glad you shine a light on that piece as it is an important investment.

Vicky Smith, IBR Transit Lead, reminded the group of Kelly's presentation at the last meeting, the demand for transit and how both BRT and LRT operate very well. We want to leverage the transit systems as much as possible.

WHAT'S NEXT, PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment at today's meeting.

Lisa reviewed the upcoming topics for the CAG and then the upcoming meetings for all groups, including the EAG on March 14th from 5:30-7:30 p.m., ESG on March 17th from 10:00-12:00 p.m. and the Bi-State Legislative Committee on March 23rd from 9:00-12:00 p.m.

WRAP UP AND THANK YOU

Greg thanked everyone for their participation and robust discussion that will be very useful for the program. Lynn thanked everyone for hanging in especially with how bumpy the ride is and how flexible everyone has been.

Ed thanked CAG members for their continued engagement, and Greg for the insight and depth of his discussions this evening. The meeting adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

CAG Members or Alternatives

Attendees	Organization
Bill Prows	Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs
Dena Horton	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Diana Nuñez	Oregon Environmental Council
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
Jeffery Temple	Fred Meyer
Julie Doumbia	At-Large Community Member
Lynn Valenter	Co-Chair
Marcus Mundy	Coalition for Communities of Color
Mark Riker	Washington State Building & Construction Trades Council
Martha Wiley	WA Transit Representative
Michael A. Martin-Tellis	Vancouver Neighborhood Association
Michael Kelly	Human Services Council
Mikaela Williams	At-Large Community Member
Robin Richardson	At-Large Community Member

March 10, 2022

Ryan Webb	The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Sam Kim	At-Large Community Member
Sheri Call	WA Trucking Association
Thomas W. Gentry	At-Large Community member
Tom Hickey	Bridgeton Neighborhood Association
Victor Cesar	Public Transit Representative, Oregon

Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Organization
Jason Hagen	IBR Program Staff
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Salome Chimuku	IBR Equity and Community Engagement
Jake Warr	IBR Equity Lead
Vicky Smith	Transit Lead
Kelly Betteridge	Transit Team
Lisa Keohokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator

Additional Participants

18 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:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a9vVrbklzvY&feature=emb_title

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here: <https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/cag-march-10-2022-meeting/>