

EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP (ESG) MEETING

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

Thursday, November 18, 2021, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

ESG Members in Attendance: Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT), Urban Mobility Office Director Brendan Finn (ODOT, Alternate), Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland), Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver), President Lynn Peterson (Metro), CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Vancouver), CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter, CAG Co-Chair Ed Washington, CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN), Director of Engineering and Construction Steve Witter (TriMet), Director Matt Ransom (RTC), Chief Public Affairs Officer Kristen Leonard (Port of Portland), Greg Johnson (IBR Program Administrator), Assistant Program Administrator Ray Mabey (ODOT), Assistant Program Administrator Frank Green (WS DOT), Millicent Williams (IBR Lead Facilitator)

ESG Members not in Attendance: Chair Scott Hughes (RTC), Director of Public Affairs JC Vanatta (TriMet, alternate), Director Kris Strickler (ODOT)

Welcome, Introduction, Proposed Agenda and Updates

Millicent Williams, Lead Facilitator, welcomed the group and thanked everyone for their continued commitment towards this work. She noted that she will also be facilitating the staff-level team meetings as well as the project managers group meetings. She then proposed to Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, that they move forward with reviewing the agenda.

Prior to beginning the agenda, Millicent reviewed ground rules and technical instructions for the meeting, including:

- Closed captions are available in English and Spanish
- Provided webinar participation tips.
- Public Input Instructions

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, noted that there was a very packed agenda, but wanted to take a moment to discuss an update regarding how the group can “get to yes” on this program. Key items he heard from partners include a desire to see more robust scenarios modeled related to demand management in the corridor and an understanding of how additional scenario modeling will impact the schedule. Mr. Johnson indicated that partners are being heard and they are working towards speaking with the bi-state legislators to make sure partner concerns are addressed and potential schedule changes are understood.

Mr. Johnson recognized those who have been sitting on the JPACT and appreciated their support for the program; the program received a unanimous “yes” for the MTIP amendment that allows the program to make progress. Next step is to speak with Metro Council which will be coming up in early December.

The floor was handed back to Millicent, who opened it up for questions and updates starting with the Departments of Transportation. Secretary Roger Millar, WSDOT, began by updating the committee that WSDOT is currently addressing issues associated with the upcoming winter (high winds, flooding). The other update worth mentioning was the passing of the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. The group is sorting this information with local/state legislators to understand what is and isn't in the bill. WSDOT budget is about \$4 billion including operations and maintenance each year; with this bill the new discretionary grant programs are going to bring approximately \$200 million each year.

Director of the Urban Mobility Office Brendan Finn, ODOT, noted that Director Strickler is currently participating in the Oregon Transportation Commission Meeting discussing the bill as well. Brendan noted they did not have much more to update but wanted to extend an appreciation to everyone for all the hard work that is being done.

Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle, City of Vancouver, updated the committee that Jo Ann Hardesty and herself made the motion and the second at JPACT to move the I-5 bridge forward.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty, City of Portland, stated that she is committed to this project – one that she envisions will reflect everyone values and is looking forward to continuing to progress.

President Lynn Peterson, Metro, thanked everyone for their vote to move this forward and Metro will be looking at the second vote on December 2, 2021. She also took time to thank Administrator Johnson for his work efforts.

Director Matt Ransom, RTC, noted that they have the same responsibility as Metro to program the funds in their TIP and will begin again early next year. This will come forward through the Department of Transportation in Washington.

Director of Engineering and Construction Steve Witter, TriMet, was happy to see that everything is moving forward and to hear about the support from the JPACT. Steve also wanted to acknowledge Greg Johnson and the partners for requesting a deep dive into the modeling from both the highway and transit side. He added that he didn't want anyone to forget the federal funding processes for both FHWA and more importantly FTA. He requested this be an agenda item in the near future for this committee.

CEO Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN, wanted to mirror what has already been said and thank Greg and the team for the extension of the modeling. One commentary on the JPACT meeting, while it did pass, there were specific questions about how climate and equity will be modeled within this project. At the previous meeting, C-TRAN requested an update from the IBR Team about what happens in each stage of the process and if changes are

made to the original record of decision (ROD) from the CRC Project, how does that play out in the IBR Project's timeline and potential funding. He concluded that is happy to see the JPACT vote.

CEO Juliann Marler, Port of Vancouver, added that this bill has significant funding options to address freight mobility and supply chain and, as I-5 is a significant freight corridor, the program should be looking at opportunities to seek funding that will address freight.

Chief Public Affairs Officer Kristen Leonard, Port of Portland, thanked Greg and IBR Team along with the JPACT; it has been an amazing effort.

Co-Chair Ed Washington, CAG, was pleased to hear the vote at JPACT and hopes to get the same from Metro. He voiced appreciation to Mr. Johnson and his team. They were presented with strong illustrations and encouraged them to continue with this approach stating that, to citizens, a picture is worth 1000 words.

Co-Chair Lynn Valenter, CAG, seconded everything that was said by Ed Washington.

Greg Johnson, requested to say a few closing words before moving to the next agenda item. He noted that the team is following the federal discussion of the infrastructure package very closely and working with the DOTs to understand what this package means for the IBR. He also emphasized that the team knows how important the schedule is to this project and its success. A joint trip is planned with both the transit partners at FTA in the near future to get a better understanding of what is needed, and by when, to better align with FTA's funding windows.

Millicent Williams, thanked everyone for their updates and comments, reviewed the agenda, and then covered the ground rules before moving onto the Equity Advisory Group update.

Equity Advisory Group Update

Johnell Bell, opened the meeting noting their team is excited to present the two core elements that are coming out of the equity program. About this time last year, they developed the concepts that will help guide the program's thinking relative to how equity is defined, how can equity be measured, and what are the ways in which the team can start thinking now about implementing some of those elements.

Dr. Roberta Hunte, EAG Facilitator, thanked everyone for their hard work and provided an update on how their work has moved forward since the last meeting. The advisory group delivered equity-focused screening criteria, incorporated accountability mechanisms into the framework, and reviewed design options for transit, interchanges, and river crossings. She hoped that the group will be used at critical decision moments to really center equity in the decision-making process. She emphasized that both process and outcomes are important when considering equity.

Dr. Hunte reviewed the different disciplines that were emphasized when developing the equity-centered screening criteria. This is really looking at how communities of concern can be affected by project decisions

and ensuring the least amount of impact. She then highlighted the criteria that were developed to align with the program's six Equity Objectives: Mobility and Accessibility, Physical Design, Community Benefits, Economic Opportunity, Decision-Making Processes, and Avoiding Further Harm. Details regarding the criteria and screening process can be found on slides 12-14 of the November 18th ESG presentation.

When looking at equity in the screening process the team focused on distances for those to travel to access high-capacity transit stations; the time traveled to get to jobs and services; looking at pedestrian infrastructure with a focus on safety for those who may be visually or hearing impaired; and addressing the remnant parcels post-construction. Jake Warr, Equity Lead, elaborated that these parcels could potentially be developed or provide community amenities, affordable housing, etc. that could make this much more than a transportation project and benefit the community more broadly.

Dr. Hunte noted that recently there were two guest speakers who shared their concerns around climate. They feel they are being left out and very afraid for their future based on decisions that are being made today and how it will affect future generations. When thinking about equity criteria, climate is an important one, but it is only as good as program implementation. The IBR Team needs to hold each other accountable in decision making.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty, City of Portland, asked a question regarding development of remnant parcels and how this piece was added to the discussion (in the past it has not been part of discussions). Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, stepped in to address the question and he noted that the project is going to require large amounts of staging areas for contractors during construction. At the end of the project, these areas will be then cleaned up and prepared for future development. At this time, the program is unsure of where these areas may be but the project would like to ensure that at the end it is beneficial to either or both communities involved with this project.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty followed up by saying that this project must benefit both communities, it can't be an either-or, and hopes to have the opportunity to weigh in before the program starts buying land. Discussion will need to include what infrastructure will be needed to accommodate the trucks and heavy equipment for the actual construction. It is vital that the program plans its vision before the project is completed.

Jake Warr, Equity Lead, began his discussion by informing the committee of what the 2020 census demographic trends are showing. It is clear that population in this region has increased with a large increase in Clark County. One thing to note is that most of this growth was among people of color, 49% in the last 10 years. Graphics were shown on slides 18-20 showing the population growth trends for Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC) and White Non-Hispanic people between the years 2010-2020. What this speaks to is how populations are shifting and where there are affordable housing options available. The implication for transportation is huge because as people move further out, their access to jobs, services, and healthcare is harder to get to.

Questions/Comments:

President Lynn Peterson, Metro, started by thanking the Equity Advisory Group for getting down into the performance metrics so the ESG and IBR team can really talk about how to move the agenda forward in a multitude of ways. She wanted to follow up on the staging conversation, in the past they have been asked to think about how these projects can be used to re-envision the city and region, whether it be light-rail or road projects, and appreciates the idea of being able to have a vision starting now and considering the range of possibilities. This early visioning merges with Metro's five-year economic recovery plan looking at bringing family-wage jobs back into the region and taking care of daycare deserts. There are many action items to consider when looking at this corridor.

Millicent Williams thanked the team for their efforts and overview and looks forward to hearing how we can continue to advance the conversation. She then directed everyone's attention to the next agenda item.

IBR and Federal Grant Funding

Millicent Williams noted that is item did not really have a place on today's agenda but given how fast things are moving they want to acknowledge its importance and wanted to provide an update. She then handed the floor over to Greg Johnson.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, showed a table that provided an overview of the major IIJA discretionary grant programs, slide 23 of the November 18th ESG presentation. The three potential grant programs and eligible project types are:

- New Competitive Bridge Investment Program – replacement, rehabilitation, preservation, or protection of bridges. At this time the thought is that is the least promising program.
- New National Infrastructure Project Assistance Program – highways and bridges, freight, intercity rail, public transportation, multimodal. This is a great program and the IBR project could be very competitive in this category.
- FTA Capital Investment Grant New Starts Program – fixed guideway transit (rail or bus rapid transit) – Meeting is scheduled with FTA to ensure that the team is making the program eligible and in line to acquire this type of funding.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty, City of Portland, acknowledged that it will take some time for the federal government to write the rules regarding how the dollars will be accessed. She asked how this project is using an equity lens and framework to look at each pot of money and determine what is the right message to move forward with? Her concern is that once the money is identified, they don't necessarily let values drive their run for those dollars. She does not want the work that has been developed in the Equity Framework to be lost.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, responded by saying the USDOT has signaled that climate and equity are at the heart of what they are seeking to address in these discretionary grant programs. The IBR team is bringing a fully formed Equity and Climate Framework to ensure the values of these communities will be reflected.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty, City of Portland, agreed and feels comforted to know that at least at the federal level there is a real commitment to undoing previous harm to communities. Is there anything being discussed around undoing the harm that freeways have done in the past? Where are those dollars, a separate package? Greg responded stating he did not know at this time and would assume that language will be embedded in all these categories that seek to address those concerns. This is just the first blush of what is understood but he's sure there will be more to come that will provide better details.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty added that they have friends who work at FTA who previously worked at the City of Portland who will be writing those rules and making sure that equity is centered and reinforces the values of this project. Greg added that Johnell Bell and himself have been giving presentations to FWHA and small businesses that were attended by the Deputy Secretary at FAA, so this program is getting recognition at a national level.

Secretary Roger Millar, WSDOT, appreciated the questions from Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty and thanked Greg and Johnell for their efforts. He noted that in the PNW, in particular, Oregon and SW Washington, everything is being measured through two lenses, climate change and equity, and everything that he does in terms of conversations with other DOTs around the country and the USDOT in regard to the discretionary grant programs, this work is going to happen.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, was given back the floor to discuss how to proceed to make the program eligible for this funding. There need to be defined project goals and consensus in this region is key critical. If the group is unable to get consensus, no one will be allocating funds to a region who can't get on the same page. Commitments from the states on allocated funds are critical knowing that federal funds come in last. The program has an advantage in the fact it is the first project to talk about equity and climate in this depth.

Matt Ransom, RTC, noted there were some within the communities that would have wanted to see more FHWA funding just for the bridge itself. He then highlighted the national significance of this project. He encouraged the departments associated with this project to go big within the prudence and reason and judgement that they want to exercise.

Tolling Overview

Millicent Williams introduced the next agenda topic and presenters, Ray Mabey and Frank Green Assistant Program Administrators.

Ray Mabey began the presentation by reviewing the industry definitions for the different pricing tolling tags and the tolling objectives, slide 27 of the November 18th ESG presentation. The three-pricing options are flat, variable, and dynamic. He did clarify that with dynamic pricing it is typically used on price managed lanes that operate adjacent to toll-free general lanes. Tolling is used for revenue generation and/or congestion relief, typically the two objectives are intertwined. Toll rate schedules can be adjusted to emphasize the primary objective.

He then covered the IBR Program and the Oregon Toll Program and noted that they are separate programs but related in coordinated efforts towards a system-wide approach to right size the system for the future. The project will need to look at each state's framework for transportation policy, and investments are being accounted for as they develop the tolling approach for the IBR project. The primary objective with tolling this bridge is funding but using a variable rate will support mobility and relieve traffic congestion. Time saving benefits of tolling would extend to all travelers but have the greatest benefits for those who have flexible work hours.

Ray continued that the team is working to ensure that consistent tolling assumptions are being considered in the traffic modeling. At this time the timing and details of how to implement tolling are still being determined, but he emphasized that the operation of the two efforts will be seamless for travelers. The Oregon Toll Program pricing limits will be determined in the 2024 timeframe and the soonest tolling could begin is late 2025.

Frank Green introduced himself to discuss the toll modeling scenarios. They felt it was important to set the foundation with these definitions and the understanding that they have been conducting a lot of coordination with the Oregon Tolling Program. A question they have been hearing from all interested parties is, what is being modeled and how does the data incorporate the system that ODOT and others have established? They are working closely with Metropolitan Planning Organizations who run the regional model to understand how these tolling scenarios will affect the modeling data and show what the demand is. They are looking for scenarios that will have rates based on the time of day that congestion is occurring.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty, City of Portland, asked if the modeling was going to take into account low-income individuals who will be using the bridge? Her hope is not to cost-burden lower income people. Are they going to be able to see this in the modeling? Frank noted that there is a slide coming up and asked to put this question on pause until Ryan presents, he might be able to address the question. She added that they are going to need this data to help make an informed decision moving forward.

Frank continued with the presentation to discuss how toll revenues will be used. He acknowledged that there is still a lot of work to be done in coordination with legislature. The team needs to look at what the federal and state funds will be targeting in order to draft a more detailed finance plan.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, came back to the question Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty previously asked. He noted that there are projects across the country where tolling programs are looking at the equitable practice of tolling low-income users of a facility. For example, I-405 has considerations and exclusions for low-

income individuals who have to travel that corridor on a regular basis. This team will be looking at this example and other programs nationwide as it continues to move forward with the IBR Project.

President Lynn Peterson, Metro, requested to go back to slide 31 of the November 18th ESG presentation and noted there are couple of policy questions that need to be answered by the ESG.

1. When they look at the different scenarios for how to set toll rates, how do they accommodate and make sure that they have reduced the burden on low-income and people of color?
2. Connected to, what type of improvements can be paid for by toll funding? There needs to be a policy discussion that needs to be transparent about how long the tolls will actually be up. Are they just used to pay for the initial build or are they going to be used for operation and maintenance as well? She feels this needs to not be a back-room conversation, what does this mean in terms of how the tolls not only are used, but what kind of rates need to be set before, after, and during?
3. How do the scenarios look at how much potential investment comes from the feds and state. She noted the that local funds will be slim to none, but wanted to know what is included in the project, not just the interstate itself that is being funded? She wants to make sure that they don't lose perspective that there are more than just bridges and interchanges - it includes interstate lane miles to be upgraded, community benefits agreements, and transit. They need to make sure those are being defined as the project moves forward.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, noted that this program impacts more than just the interstate. They will be looking at all questions in the overall program costs. It is not the intention to push these costs onto other parties.

Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle, City of Vancouver, stressed the importance of addressing the policy questions presented by Lynn Peterson and that they don't get stuck in a parking lot. Referring to the last bullet on slide 31 that discusses other improvements that can be paid for with toll funding and specifically community benefits and mitigation. As was seen earlier, many people are moving to access affordable housing in other communities; the program will need to structure tolling in a way that does not hurt those who can't afford to live in the area. As the program looks at the other transportation options, this team needs to have a conversation about funding sources.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, noted as they get closer to the definition of what the project is going to be in the first and second quarters of next year these are conversations they will be having. Right now, they don't what this project is going to be so once they have clarity, they will then bring these issues into the conversation. Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle noted the primary goal for funding used for tolling was the construction piece and secondary was the congestion relief, both appreciated but she would like to get consistent language regarding variable rates.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty, City of Portland, voiced her concern about going out for bonds before this question is answered and if we do that, we are stuck in our old way of doing what we have always done. She

would like to know that there will be no bonds sold before the group has the opportunity to get these questions addressed about tolling and that options are not limited because of other activities happening outside of this process.

Secretary Roger Millar, WSDOT, noted the purpose of this presentation was intended for an overview and understands that not all questions can be addressed today. They will not be selling any bonds in Washington State until the state legislature authorizes them to do so. He added he does not do two things: appropriate money or write the laws.

Director of the Urban Mobility Office Brendan Finn, ODOT, pointed out that through the last legislative session, House Bill 3055 directed Oregon Toll Program to come back and report to legislature in September with income-based data which will be used in the IBR Program.

Millicent Williams thanked Secretary Roger Millar for reinforcing this is not intended to be a problem-solving session, but rather getting the conversation on the table. It is good to acknowledge that the group needs to discuss, solve, and resolve this topic to meets the expectations of the folks around this table and the people they are all here to serve.

With interest in time, Frank Green said that much of the next slide was discussed. The last slide was focused on the schedule for both the Level 2 and 3 Toll Traffic and Revenue Study development, which is dependent on having an agreed IBR solution in spring 2022.

Questions/Comments:

President Lynn Peterson, Metro, noted that it would be helpful that as they have these discussions over the next months that these policy questions be in the front and to organize the presentation around them, so they know that everyone is being heard and they don't lose sight of them.

Matt Ransom, RTC, noted that clarity is important. There are two counties that currently pay tolls to use bridges and right now they do not have a monolithic view of tolling. He asked: What can we do and what can we aspire to do? Constituents are looking for high return on investment (ROI) and the outcome and toll is a piece of that.

Millicent Williams noted that this program has to work to ensure that communication is effective and that the group is working to solve problems. The group needs to gain consensus or agreement on how to proceed.

Overview of Travel Demand Modeling (Modeling 101)

Millicent Williams introduced Ryan LeProwse, Transportation/Planning Lead and requested that he be allowed the opportunity to get through his entire presentation before any questions or comments. She also reminded the group that enough time needs to be provided for public comment.

Ryan provided an introduction of Travel Demand Modeling (TDM) by defining how it is used and who uses it. To review the details, refer to slides 36-44 of the November 18th ESG presentation. The process is performed using four steps:

- trip generation – how many trips are made?
- trip distribution – matching the origins and destinations by purpose
- mode choice – how are the trips made? What is the choice of modes and the factors that impact that choice?
- trip assignment – which routes do people take? Auto vs. Transit

The next slide discussed the validation review process which includes the calibration and validation of the results and review the findings on a regular basis with FHWA and FTA while Metro and RTC conduct on-going peer reviews. He lastly noted that this modeling effort is being built upon the previous modeling conducted for the CRC.

Ryan's last slide covered the uses of the TDM for the IBR Program which will include the evaluation of design options and support environmental impact analysis.

Before opening the floor to questions and comments Millicent noted that speed in which Ryan went through his presentation is not an indication of how important the modeling and its outcomes are. There have been a series of requests that have been made to the IBR team, some can be responded to easily while others may take months to determine final resolution. The team is working to ensure clarity about the "asks" and provide the best information in a way that allows members to engage stakeholders and make an informed decision moving forward. To speak to Mr. Washington's comment, the team is focusing on ways, not necessarily, to make this information less technical and but making it more digestible. The team is working on prioritizing the requests to make sure decisions can be made in a timely manner to move this project forward.

Questions/Comments:

President Lynn Peterson, Metro, commented how much she appreciates the effort that goes into TDM as previously she was modeler for Metro. She noted that scenarios are all relative to each other, that they are not providing an exact answer and are not something they should not be designing to. This is just a way to have a conversation and if it's not the future we want, then we need to have a policy conversation about what it takes to make the future we want. She also would like to make sure that when they are presented, the information about assumptions is clear for each scenario, so they are not comparing apples to oranges, so they understand what they are comparing and what was assumed. This is really going to be important for them to understand the outputs.

Matt Ransom, RTC, thanked Ryan and noted that the Metro RTC model is best in class and what that means for this work and for comparing alternatives against each other. A word of caution for everyone is the absolute

numbers are not the prediction of the future. This is a model, but the math that underlies these analysis tools is best in class. Second, he would like those who watch this to understand that the teams who do this are walled off from the policy makers and they are asking broad questions and proposing different hypotheses; it's important to know that these people spend their life's work making sure that the tool has the best math, the best integration of social and economic characteristics. We want the public to trust in this conversation and have faith in Ryan, RTC, and Metro's teams.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty, City of Portland, needed to step out of the meeting but appreciated all that was presented today and looks forward to future conversations. Millicent Williams also noted that Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle, City of Vancouver, had to leave the meeting due to a 12:00 meeting as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Millicent Williams reviewed the comment instructions prior to opening the floor.

Commenter [1:50:27]: Hi, I am Joseph Courtright with No More Freeways. I want to comment on the projections in tolling. It is striking to me that ODOT and WSDOT are claiming they have ruled out other alternatives without undertaking any traffic projections. The only traffic projects they have are from the FEIS based on the data from 2005. You are ruling out alternatives based on outdated information, and you have no intention of completing the actual projections that would be updated before the next two years or so. Moreover, we know that the projections have to incorporate tolling. Tolling will dramatically affect demand. The projections that were done by CDM Smith as part of the analysis showed that traffic on the I-5 bridges would drop from about 125,000 vehicles a day to about 80,000 vehicles a day. That has built a giant amount of capacity that would not get used and you are repeating exactly step by step the mistakes made with the CRC by kicking the can down the road on realistic traffic analysis. What you need to do is before you advance any alternatives, before you rule out any alternatives, is do the traffic modeling first because what you are doing right now is the opposite of planning. With due respect to the staff and everyone, essentially what you are inviting the models to do is ratify the choices that you have already made. Instead of that, you should take a scientific approach, get accurate current data, and give lots of opportunities for other outside the back rooms of the ODOT modeling process to have a say and review because in the past you have repeatedly been wrong. No one has ever gone back to looked at the projections that were built into that to see whether they are accurate. I'll just note, we are more than half the way through the project forecast period, so we already know the answer and that is those projections were wrong. Bad modeling.

Brent Hamilton noted Joseph was at his 2-minute time and thanked him for the comment.

Commenter [1:52:43]: Thank you Brent, my name is Graciela Gomez Cowger, and I am the Chief Executive Officer Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt law firm with 160 attorneys located in seven offices across California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska very much a PNW regional firm. Schwabe has long and very much supported replacing the I-5 bridge. The current bridge is functionally obsolete with narrow shoulders, short merge zones, and minimal public transit service. It does not support the needs of commerce and our commuting population. The current bridge is chronically congested. As a resident of Clark County for over 25 years with a

professional life centered in Portland, I have personally seen traffic increase over more than two decades that I have been traversing the bridge almost daily. My commute has increased from 40 minutes to well over an hour depending on the time of day. The worst part, I think, in the last several years is the commute is unpredictable and not subject to advance planning with a simple accident resulting in miles and miles of traffic backup. The I-5 bridge congestion will continue to exacerbate as it has in the last several years, as the population in the region increases by at least another 500,000 residents as is projected the current bridge should be replaced and rather than repaired. The I-5 bridge is a critical economic lifeline for the entire West Coast and a key route to improved regional economic prosperity for all of us. We must not allow the I-5 bridge to continue to be among the worst choke points nationally for transportation of freight and commerce. With the passage of the federal \$1.2 trillion bipartisan infrastructure framework, we are at a historic moment in our county and region to make transformational investments to replace the I-5 bridge.

Brent Hamilton noted that we were at time. Graciela thanked the group for the opportunity to provide comment. This was the last comment of the meeting. Millicent thanked the commentors for the feedback and participation in today's meeting.

ADJOURN

Millicent Williams noted that before we adjourn, we quickly review next steps and agenda items for the December 16th meeting.

- Economic Impact Analysis Review
- Progress on Developing Design Options
- Community Working Groups and Fall Community Engagement

Are there any additional topics that would be of value that they would like to see on the agenda?

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, hopes to have clarity on a schedule for moving the IBR solution forward into the process. Once they hear from the bi-state legislative team next week and understand all the nuances from partners, they hope to have that as part of the conversation in December.

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN), would like to see an update on the work being done from a community advisory standpoint and other meetings (FTA and FHWA) and how they could impact the schedule. The program has an aggressive timeline and as they talk about trade-offs, it is important for the public to know through the ESG we are taking in a lot of information as a group and what we intend to do with that as a function of an expedited schedule. He also wanted to thank the team for doing a great job.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, thanked everyone for the great questions.

The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

November 18, 2021

MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k_uOrevXFk

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/esg-november-18-meeting/>