

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #16

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

Subject: Community Advisory Group Meeting #16 Summary

Date and Time: April 14, 2022 3:00-6:00 pm

Location: Zoom meeting and YouTube Livestream

WELCOME AND OUTCOMES

Ed Washington, CAG co-chair, welcomed the group to the day's meeting. Johnell Bell, CAG Co-Facilitator, reviewed the technical instructions for the meeting and the agenda.

PROGRAM UPDATE

Greg Johnson, IBR Program Administrator, shared that yesterday Senator Cantwell visited with the IBR team at the base of the Interstate bridge. The event was well covered by media in both the Portland and Seattle areas. Senator Cantwell described the variety of funding opportunities available. Greg gave a shoutout to CAG member Sam Kim who did a great job describing the CAG's role within the IBR program. Greg also met with local business owners who brought in other mega project managers from across the country to discuss the pit falls and success routes to complete various projects.

Greg then transitioned to discussing the modified Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and how it fits into the programs overall process. He clarified that the LPA had previously been called the "IBR Solution" and then defined it as "the early agreement by all the transportation entities and ESG on what is going to be taken into the next phase of study. The high-level identification of the foundational components". The LPA is not the final solution or design, and technical analysis will continue to occur. The next phase will expose any fatal flaws so that the program is able to correct where needed.

Question and Answer

CAG Member: I had a conversation with someone who represents several businesses on Hayden Island and asked that I share their point of view. They expressed a preference for the full interchange option as that gives them the best access for the customers and freight delivery on the island. They understood the concerns about keeping the footprint to a minimum for livability. They are not concerned about the access from

Vancouver, but they are concerned about the partial interchange access from Oregon to Hayden Island. This is something the Bridgeton community noted as well. Their concerns are for freight delivery having to go through a very confusing series of roundabouts, at least based on the current sketch, that will be very discouraging to freight and business traffic to and from the island.

Greg: Understood. Both scenarios have pluses, minuses, and tradeoffs. Those are considerations as we develop a recommendation. We understand there will be tradeoffs and we don't want to harm businesses on Hayden Island, but we also want to be respectful of the current residents who have told us that the current ramp and convoluted entrances and exits are very detrimental to life on the island. We will be looking at these issues and this will not be the last opportunity for feedback to make it better.

CAG Member: I hadn't decided if I wanted to speak out about the roundabouts yet, but they continue to be an issue for heavy trucks and there will be a lot of truck traffic in most of the plans. The roundabout design and quantity are a concern to us. We just had an incident in the last week where a truck rolled over in a roundabout, that is not an infrequent occurrence. We tend to oppose them on freight routes in general and you have a lot of freight traffic there so keep that in mind.

Greg: We will be looking at the most current roundabout designs. Right now, these are just conceptual, and not final. If they are included, we will ensure they are built to the most robust and modern standards so that freight traffic will not have an issue moving through.

MARCH 24TH HAYDEN ISLAND/MARINE DRIVE FEEDBACK

Lisa Keokokalole Schauer, CAG Co-Facilitator, and Johnell summarized the CAG feedback provided at the previous meeting on the Hayden Island/Marine Drive design options.

CAG Member: In all the discussions I have with folks who either live or work on Hayden Island, there is confusion over the term "congestion" vs. "travel time". I think most people are equating the two, but I don't believe that is true within the IBR program. We are focusing on congestion, while travel time is not an issue. Is that how you see it?

Ryan LeProwse, Transportation Planning Lead: Congestion and travel time are somewhat related, and both are very important. Congestion is an indication at a specific location while travel time is from point A to point B. They are slightly different, and both will be considered in the IBR program.

CAG Member: For the sake of the public perception, it would be helpful to add travel time to our considerations.

TRANSIT INVESTMENT WINNOWING

Kelly Betteridge, Transit Lead, reviewed how transit options are being winnowed down for the next phase of the project.

Question and Answer

CAG Member: I noticed in the last presentation; the no build alternative was defined as leaving the current bridge as is. I thought we had decided that the no build alternative was the CRC LPA. Did I misunderstand something?

Kelly: When we look at a specific transit investment and forecast to the future (2045), the no build option assumes all the investments in the other various regional plans are built, but the program does not occur. That is to isolate the assumed benefits of the program.

CAG Member: Are we using that same no build definition in other areas of the Program or is this only for transit?

Ryan: Yes, the No Build concept is used in traffic, transit, and other impact analysis.

Kelly: It's all the same No Build whether we're talking about transit or traffic.

CAG Member: You talked about the projected ridership difference in LRT vs BRT. Is there somewhere I can read more about that?

Kelly: Yes. I believe we will be providing follow up information so that you can read more.

CAG Member: I am concerned that because we're data driven, we continue to give the statistics on the increase in populations in Clark County. If you do a deeper dive, you find the number that you're giving is totally wrong. The population did increase by 77,938 in Clark County between 2010-2020, but the white alone category increased by 70,091 which is 89.1%. If you look at the quick stat that you took, any of the government entities that do a deeper dive or at the census bureau's basis, you'll find that that number is wrong. I hope that we support equity completely, but to go forward with that number after we've brought it up many times causes a lot of concern. I have asked for that number before and didn't get it, so I researched it. If you were to go by your number, the increase from 2010 to 2020 would only be 6% and it was 89%.

Jason Hagen, IBR Community Advisory Group Administrator: I know you have brought this up before and we have gone back to our equity and analysis teams to give them the number you and Sam Kim

brought us. We tried to recreate them and couldn't. Our team went back to verify the numbers and the team is 100% sure their numbers are correct. I will follow up with you individually to make sure we're all on the same page.

CAG Member: In regard to Kelly's presentation, the numbers and equity, you mentioned once that if the LRT goes across the river, it provides more access to the waterfront district. But I thought you said the growth in the waterfront district was very diverse, high equity, high POC. When you talk about increasing diversity in Vancouver, are you talking specifically about the waterfront or in the city as a whole?

Kelly: There are two answers to this. What has changed since 2013 was specific to the substantial growth within the waterfront and a desire to serve that population with the HCT investment. In my presentation there were no specific demographic information of folks in that area, just a lot of development and desire to serve it. The second piece was to highlight the growth that has occurred in Clark County as a whole.

CAG Member: Would it be possible for Tom and me, maybe even Marcus if he is interested, to meet with the person who provided the data? I know you sent me the data, but I would like to work off the same data and would like to figure it out offline so that we are all in agreement.

Jason: Thank you. We will find a way to make sure everyone here is aware. So yes, we will absolutely do that.

Jake Warr, IBR Equity Lead: Going back to the previous conversation on the BIPOC population numbers in Clark County, I believe the discrepancy comes from the definition of white vs BIPOC. The census separates race and ethnicity, and the only options for ethnicity are Hispanic/Latino or not Hispanic/Latino. If you just select "white" for race, regardless of what ethnicity they selected, you're going to include people who selected white and Hispanic/Latino in that total and that's going to be higher than if you have a BIPOC definition that includes people who selected Hispanic/Latino for their ethnicity. The 86%, as a side note I recall seeing folks use Quick Facts for their data, but there is a discrepancy between that site and what the raw census data shows, the percentage of white is much higher if you include folks who are Hispanic/Latino and that's going to impact growth numbers. If you use the BIPOC definition that includes Hispanic/Latino the growth is 76% in Clark County over the last 10 years. I've given Jason a detailed report on this that we can provide to anyone who wants to look at it further.

Jason: Yes, I will distribute that to this group.

CAG Members: We need to have a discussion on the accuracy of these numbers. Even though I know the Census says Hispanic/Latino was counted twice, through the “white alone” percentages. So, I would like to have further discussion offline before these numbers are finalized.

Jake: I would be happy to do so. But I want to reiterate that “white alone” means only that they selected white for their race. They could have selected Hispanic/Latino or not Hispanic/Latino for their ethnicity. So, the comparison for BIPOC is anyone who selected “white alone” and “not Hispanic/Latino”.

CAG Member: I suggest that once the numbers are released, those interested in discussing meet offline.

Jake: Yes, happy to do that.

TRANSIT INVESTMENT BREAKOUT GROUP DISCUSSION

Group 1 Debrief

Jason reported that his group had an overwhelming amount of support for Light Rail and appreciated Kelly’s presentation and Vicky for explaining how the City of Vancouver’s express bus will accompany any HCT system implemented by the program. The group had some thoughts on BRT regardless of the dedicated line or street there are always examples of buses slowing down so light rail is the preference there. From the freight perspective, the option that can take the most automobiles off the road is the best. The group was very invested in forward thinking and predictive modeling, thinking what will be desired in 25, 30, 40 years down the road so we are building for that future. This again lent itself better to light rail. A need for more data was asked about, particularly in predictive modeling.

Group 2 Debrief

Irena Phillips, CAG Member, reported that her group had a large discussion on how beneficial and useful it is to have a one seat ride going from Downtown Vancouver to Downtown Portland. Otherwise, their group touched on many of the same points as the first group. They did discuss park and rides and Greg mentioned that neither downtown Portland or downtown Vancouver are interested in setting up a big park and ride in the downtown area, and Clark College isn’t very enthusiastic about the prospect either. The group then discussed adding some constraints in the model to take that into account. Someone brought up that if autonomous vehicles are more prevalent, a park and ride may not be needed.

Group 3 Debrief

Lynn Valenter, CAG co-chair, did the report out for her group. They began with express buses, for anyone going from point to point, are very efficient and will probably be sticking around. The group also landed on LRT to support more of the CAGs priorities, but it must be in conjunction with BRT. There was concern that if it is just LRT, that it's not really meeting some of the community's needs, including work. Another point was the more families who only have one vehicle, the better for everyone else and the environment. The group also discussed the reality of differences between Clark County and Portland, how far into Clark County it would go, and what Clark County's tolerance is for LRT to the north. While there may be widespread support for LRT, the community also has diverging opinions dating back to 2013. The group also discussed why transit was being discussed again and what changes since 2013 triggered the discussion.

CAG Member: I'm sure ALA would love to have light rail to their front door, maybe they can help with funding.

Group 4 Debrief

Jake reported that his group began by discussing the model assumptions. Could a lane be HCT in the day and general/freight lane in the evening? He clarified that that sort of thing wasn't being considered. Most of the group coalesced around LRT because of the greater ridership and lack of a transfer if going from Vancouver to Portland. That wasn't consensus though as there were questions around demand, if that level of ridership is needed and how that relates to the tolls being considered. The group also discussed the assumption for bus on shoulder. The last topic they covered was that down the road all fleets, including buses, will be electric.

AUXILIARY LANES

Ryan gave an update on ramp-to-ramp (auxiliary lane) connections. Ryan shared a presentation and [video](#) to illustrate how auxiliary lanes function generally and at the bridge.

CAG Member: Auxiliary lanes look amazing from a commuter standpoint. I want to have as many lanes as possible but that is going to increase the footprint of the bridge, right? How much is it going to increase the footprint, and will that be a problem for residents and businesses?

Ryan: Those designs are still being determined, but we need to fit the bridge back into the IBR corridor on each side, which is 3 lanes in each direction. During construction you have to think about how we keep traffic open. The designs are similar within the right of way, north and south. We are looking at trying to limit the impacts to right of way. Hopefully next time I can give you a more detailed answer with pictures.

CAG Member: Can you please talk about how auxiliary lanes function with the stacked bridge option and how that is different than with the flat bridge?

Ryan: I wasn't prepared for that question, but I don't think they are that different. The stacked bridge has two directions for traffic, one on each level. You must get to grade and all that but there isn't really a difference in the design or how many you can have.

CAG Member: you just must have a larger climb to get up to that larger level?

Ryan: it's the grade, I don't think it actually extends the climb length they would just increase the grade. I'll let my design team come back and answer your technical design question.

CAG Member: Ballparking figures, between option 2 and option 3, which is more expensive and by how much?

Ryan: We will get back to you on that, we're still working on those details.

Lynn Valenter: Auxiliary lanes seem like they can determine travel times and congestion when we've already decided on three lanes each way. Not quite a secret weapon, but weapon of choice. My guess is that the option with one auxiliary lane mitigates some but the option with two auxiliary lanes would be the technically desirable solution if maximizing traffic. Could you provide some bigger picture ideas about auxiliary lanes? And I know you said safety is a big plus, but are there other benefits we should be aware of? And from your perspective when would you use aux lanes and when wouldn't you?

Ryan: Aux lanes are a tool, just like braided ramps or collector distributor ramps. Aux lanes are great for short interchange spaces with high volumes. They provide a way for people to get on and up to speed safely without having to force their way in. The mainline has to slow and speed up in reaction. The reason we are looking at them now is volume. We have too many very important interchanges and auxiliary lanes would be a typical tool.

Lynn: Are there any budget or footprint restrictions?

Ryan: Yes, and lane balance restrictions. We have freeway to freeway connections, to SR 500 is a freeway to freeway connection. You can add two lanes coming from a state route, people understand that it's a state route and heavy volume. You don't want to just go for 3, 4, 5 aux lanes but want it to be balanced which is very difficult to explain. In the one and two aux lane scenario, they include HCT and demand management. There's a lot of management being done, so we're not just expanding forever.

Greg: The other argument from a set of folks who believe if you build a bigger bridge, you will induce more traffic to use it. There is a theory that if we solve congestion more people will be induced to use this bridge.

CAG Member: Could you expand on how aux lanes fit with the HCT? How do you get the trains or buses off?

Ryan: There will be a grade separated HCT corridor, and no matter the bridge design they will be on their own system, so they will not interact. The express buses would interact depending on their location, working their way over to the shoulder as needed.

CAG Member: Am I wrong in thinking an auxiliary lanes can only exist from one interchange to the next?

Ryan: They can go beyond one interchange, one example of that is SR 500, it brings on two lanes, drops one at 4th plain, carries the second one through, picks up a second auxiliary lane at 4th plain and then drops two lanes at Mill Plain.

Ed Washington: I certainly wouldn't want your job but thank you all for your hard work.

WHAT'S NEXT, PUBLIC COMMENT

Lisa reviewed the upcoming topics for the CAG and the upcoming meetings for all groups, including the EAG on April 18th from 5:30-7:30 p.m. and the ESG on April 21st from 10:00-12:00 p.m.

Public Comment

4141: Hello, My name is Peter Stark. I represent a number of commercial properties in the Hayden Island area and a number of property owners. I appreciate Tom's earlier comment about the concern at the intersection and I also wanted to point out that, at the beginning of the meeting under the CAG Marine Drive/Hayden Island feedback, item 4 was "keeping the commercial freight industry up to date, hearing their concerns should be ongoing". I'd like to push that further. I think we need to make it a major component of the design. Freight and commercial movement are critical to and from Hayden Island are critical to the 3,000 industrial jobs and 22,000 total jobs on Hayden Island. Some of the businesses won't survive unless the bigger rigs can get on the island. The number of roundabouts, the strange methodology to get to Hayden Island from the Oregon side. I hope that the engineers will consider that from the economic point of view the impact to Hayden Island could be significant. I'm really just calling in to say that I know it is a complex problem and Hayden Island is relatively small, but those businesses are critical to the people that work there.

WRAP UP AND THANK YOU

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. He felt that the meeting today was a step forward.

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
Dena Horton	Pacific Northwest Waterways Association
Ed Washington	Co-Chair
Irina Phillips	At-Large Community Member
Jana Jarvis	OR Trucking Association
Javier Navarro	At-Large Community Member
Jeffery Temple	I-205 Business Interest
Julie Doumbia	At-Large Community Member
Lynn Valenter	Co-Chair
Marcus Mundy	Coalition for Communities of Color
Martha Wiley	WA Transit Representative
Michael Kelly	Human Services Council
Mikaela Williams	At-Large Community Member
Robin Richardson	At-Large Community Member
Ryan Webb	The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
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

April 14, 2022



Victor Cesar	Public Transit Representative, Oregon
Tom Sandhawr	Clark College representative

Facilitators and Presenters

Attendees	Organization
Greg Johnson	IBR Program Administrator
Ryan LeProwse	IBR Transportation Planning Manager
Kelly Betteridge	IBR Transit Lead
Jake Warr	IBR Equity Lead
Jason Hagen	IBR Community Advisory Group Administrator
Lisa Keokokalole Schauer	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator
Johnell Bell	IBR CAG Co-Facilitator

Additional Participants

22 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](#).