

EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP (ESG) MEETING

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

April 21, 2022, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

ESG Members in Attendance: Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT), Assistant Director of Government and External Relations Lindsey Baker (ODOT), President Lynn Peterson (Metro), Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland), Executive Director Curtis Robinhold (Port of Portland), Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver), CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Vancouver), General Manager Sam Desue (TriMet), Director Matt Ransom (RTC), CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN), CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter, CAG Co-Chair Ed Washington, Councilor Mary Nolan (Metro)

ESG Members not in Attendance: Director Kris Strickler (ODOT)

IBR Program Staff in Attendance: Administrator Greg Johnson (Program Administrator), John Willis (Program Manager), Millicent Williams (Lead Facilitator), Ray Mabey (Assistant Program Administrator), Frank Green (Assistant Program Administrator)

WELCOME, INTRODUCTION, PROPOSED AGENDA AND UPDATES

Millicent Williams, Lead Facilitator, opened the meeting by introducing everyone who was participating and asked if anyone has anything they needed to share in relation to the program or within their jurisdiction but asked that if it was not pressing to please hold as today's agenda was a full one.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE

Millicent noted that Administrator Johnson was not able to attend the beginning of meeting due to personal reasons but will be joining later and asked if Ray Mabey or Frank Green has any opening comments or updates. Ray joined and agreed that with the full agenda, the meeting should get started and appreciates everyone's willingness to participate.

IBR ESG UPDATE ON RAMP-TO-RAMP CONNECTIONS (AUXILIARY LANES)

Ryan LaProwse, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a quick presentation on ramp-to-ramp connections (auxiliary lanes, slides 10-12) which included a list of the purpose and need and the desired outcomes. He encouraged the ESG to think about the highlighted desired outcomes as they review the trade-

off and benefits. He noted that as they go into the NEPA process, they will have more information that will dive into station access and active transportation trip potential along with additional interchange and ramp information.

Background Traffic/Design Information

Ryan gave an overview of the seven closely spaced interchanges

- Slide 17 provided data on traffic growth rates between 2005 and 2019.
- Slide 18 provided average weekday volumes for vehicles and freight and compared the Interstate Bridge and I-205 Glenn Jackson Bridge.
- Slide 19 showed weekday hourly profiles for vehicles and freight volumes, northbound.
- Slide 20 and 21 showed AM peak hour southbound and PM peak hour northbound to and from the seven interchanges within the project area. There are high volumes of on and off traffic within the program area (low through volumes).
- Slide 22 showed AM peak 1-hour ramp traffic volumes. Again, showing heavy flows on and off ramps.
- Slide 23 showed existing varying PM peak 1-hour traffic volumes. Ryan pointed out that there are some ramps that specifically are higher during off peak due to their patterns or flows. One example is SR14 where southbound on and off ramp volumes actually peak in the PM. This information is helpful when looking at number of lanes and number of lanes for ramp terminals/designs.
- Slide 24 discussed bottleneck locations in the program area. An additional one outside of the project area is on I-5 in Rose Quarter that affects our project data.
- Slide 25 highlighted the crash data in the IBR program area (2015-2019) by hour and type.
- Slide 26 highlighted safety issues.

Commissioner Hardesty: Question in regards to the 55% rear-ends due to congestion. What did you base this statement on? Ryan clarified that it was a general trend. There are a lot of rear-end collision and property damage-only collisions that are related to congestion in this case but can occur at non-congestion times. Commissioner Hardesty noted that speed also plays a factor in these types of incidents.

Ramp-to-Ramp Connections (Auxiliary Lanes)

- Slide 28 and 29 covered auxiliary lanes (also referred to as aux lanes), their definition, and provided a video explaining how they work.
- Slide 30 showed aux lanes that exist today within the program area. This is to show areas/examples of where they exist within our region
- Slide 31-32 provided an overview of program design considerations.
- Slide 34 covered elements that the auxiliary lanes for IBR are proposed to address.

April 21, 2022

- Slide 35 explained future volume/mode share forecasting
- Slide 36 covered IBR tolling sensitivity analysis, purpose of tolling, and initial takeaways. Before closing he added that the toll rates are not yet set by the transportation commissions so this was a sensitivity analysis looking at different rates and impacts on auto and transit numbers today.

Commissioner Hardesty asked for clarification about the initial takeaways regarding tolling. Ryan clarified that they ran multiple scenarios for I-5 only. The Oregon Regional Mobility pricing project is on its own timeframe, so the program ran scenarios with and without that project.

- Slide 37 provided a map of the auxiliary lane options (no build 2045, 1 and 2 auxiliary lanes).
- Slides 38-40 provided the data summary for each of the three aux lane options (no build, 1 and 2 auxiliary lanes). These data summaries covered the following scoring information:
 - Overall graphic showing the project area with auxiliary detail
 - Travel time (minutes)
 - Congestion index (peak period)
 - Heat Maps
 - Daily Mode Share (PM 1-hour) with percentages for vehicle, transit, freight, and bike/pedestrian
 - Equity
 - Climate
 - Cost
 - Footprint

Commissioner Hardesty asked if human travel behavior is expected to will change between now and 2045 and how this may show in the models. Ryan responded that Metro and RTC are the ones who run the models for travel demand forecasting and they are taking these trends and behavior changes into consideration. Included in their predications are individuals working from home, electric vehicle conversions, and other similar assumptions. These are the same between no build and the build options, but the build has different transit assumptions or different IBR program assumptions but the overall assumptions that Commissioner Hardesty is talking about are part of the travel demand process and what is provided by the partners of the program.

Secretary Millar reminded the group that models are designed to inform decision-making, and they do not make the decision. They inform decisions that people make, and they are simplifying assumptions in any model, about human behavior, for example, most models are built around the economics, the cost of time; value judgments do not weigh in. The important take away is the everyone should acknowledge that models are valuable tools, but we need to have value-based decisions informed by that data.

Ryan added that Metro and RTC have user surveys they use to collect this information on how individuals make those choices. These include considerations for how to get to a place, how many trips one takes and does that individual always uses a vehicle, transit, or bike/ped. With this information, the model is then calibrated, and they predict future changes in regard to mode.

Curtis Robinhold voiced his appreciation of the slides. Curtis is concerned about how you get cars off north and northeast Portland streets and on the highway when you are north of the Rose Quarter. He also noted that he was intrigued with the 2 auxiliary lane option regarding the asymmetry north versus south, and if there was consideration given to 2 auxiliary lanes with one directions and 1 auxiliary lane in another. If two auxiliary lanes don't affect southbound because the bottleneck is actually further south than the IBR project area, would it make sense to consider 2 auxiliary lanes going north and 1 going south?

Ryan responded to the first item of concern, noting that these graphics are showing freeway main lines and the backups at the interchanges with these conditions. Local street impacts will be more completely summarized in the NEPA analysis. To address the asymmetry question, we need to understand maintenance of traffic during construction, how to maintain operations during construction and right now that is an important fact that is not currently summarized on these data sheets. This will be discussed further as we move into the next phase of the project. Frank Green noted that Ryan summarized it very well and added that as the program started seeing some of the data, that is absolutely a question that the program will be thinking about. Does it need to be symmetric or can we look at benefits of different auxiliary lanes in each direction. He feels they need to look at this throughout the corridor. The program will definitely be studying this as they move forward.

Secretary Millar: When we had the conversation leading up to this about auxiliary lanes, the conversation should really be more about safety rather than congestion. The video that was shown prior to this was about how auxiliary lanes reduce crashes. When looking at congestion index, auxiliary lanes do not do a lot for congestion. So, does it reduce crashes at the bridge?

Ryan noted that at this time he does not have an answer, but yes there will be an improvement over today. Hayden Island there currently is no shoulder so they will be improvements in safety. Ryan added that there is not a lot of difference between the one auxiliary lane option and the No Build. The program will be looking into how to analyze this and calculate the information to support this data. The two auxiliary lane option brings down the congestion-related collisions.

Secretary Millar added that the system that we put in place and the policy decisions that we have made resulted in three through lanes in each direction through Portland and north of the river; that basic framework means there is going to be peak-hour congestion. Going from two [aux lanes] down to one saves

us \$100 million; he needs to see safety data because that was what they were selling auxiliary lanes on in the previous program. This [safety] will be more important to him than saving two minutes, 25 years from now.

CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter asked a question regarding the existing auxiliary lanes that disappeared from the area around the Interstate Avenue/Victory Boulevard, possibly Marine Drive. Ryan responded by saying that these stick diagrams show general mainline on and off ramps. There are parallel roads and collector distributors to support some of those movements, so what is occurring in the Hayden Island/Marine Drive is there is an auxiliary lane today because the interchange spacing is half a mile or less. The program ended up braiding these, in this case, because the Hayden Island/Marine Drive interchange options that have been looked at with the partial versus the full interchange. He referenced the graphic on slide 39 showing that, instead of an auxiliary lane on the mainline, you have a braided ramp that has taken that into account and has removed auxiliary lanes from the mainline in this section.

Commission Hardesty: She finds it interesting that they will get better results with one auxiliary lane on SR500 and I-205 to 405 and appears we get better results by doing almost nothing and then we get better results constructing only on auxiliary lane. She does not know how we can model for 2045 without taking into account climate and BIPOC communities and how they are going to be impacted by this. She is still concerned that if they are not talking about reducing greenhouse gas emissions at the same time, they are talking about moving freight and automobiles, then they are losing the opportunity to build a system for 2045. The question is, do we want to increase capacity? She says no, she would like to decrease it on I-5 and would like to make sure they are using it in the most equitable and climate-friendly manner. The question is what does equity mean in this whole scenario. How are you centering the communities that are going to be impacted by this program?

Ryan apologized if he went over the information too quickly but noted the “dials” under the data summaries where they have equity index showing you the increased modal options as a general assumption and climate showing anticipated GHG reduction, mode shift away from SOV, variable rate tolling which are all climate-centric metrics that are inclusive of the overall IBR program.

Ryan provided clarification on Commissioner Hardesty’s question regarding no build and auxiliary comparison. He noted that there is travel time improvement northbound pm, 35 minutes down to 24 with the one auxiliary lane. The issue is the backup all the way to downtown Portland, and it is the same case in existing and no build. They need to extend the model to have further distance to capture the entire difference because there is change, it is just outside the limits.

Hardesty flagged that daily mode share did not move at all when it come to mass transit and feels that it will change significantly when people have more options for how they get around. Ryan noted this is hard to see

but the footnote at the bottom of the graphic states that transit is over-capacity. This data only shows what can be served.

President Peterson: Her question is a combination of sensitivity analysis, traffic operations, and tolling. As you look at the number of auxiliary lanes and look at the sensitivity and traffic operations with and without tolls and each additional auxiliary lane is not equivalent. When you add one auxiliary lane you get a big benefit, when you add two you don't get the same incremental benefit and feels it is a declining benefit. When this is combined with tolling, what is the sensitivity on the second auxiliary lane? What is the confidence that it actually has benefit?

Ryan requested to move forward with reviewing the two auxiliary lane slide and then come back to the question (Slide 40).

President Peterson: What we know from traffic operations and engineering is that each additional auxiliary lane has less and less benefit due to the merge-weave that occurs. The more merging and weaving that is happening the less actual throughput you are going to get. The question is, with or without tolling has the program done the sensitivity analysis to find out whether the additional benefit is actually needed from a second auxiliary lane or not based on the tolling impact to the traffic operations.

Ryan noted the tolling sensitivity information highlights the different tested toll scenarios plus the regional mobility pricing program included the main trade-offs that reduce volume on I-5, sometimes you increase volume on I-5 which gets to the sensitivity in regard to the volumes going up and down. The other component to consider is the transit portion and the kind of forecast for transit and the amount that can be served in demand. The auxiliary lanes are trying to help with safety of the corridor with the short interchange spacing and heavy on and off ramps. President Peterson understood the comparison but, as the program moves through the study, she would like to see the traffic operation impacts, not just a planning-level overview and looking at the trade-offs and benefits.

Ryan continued with the presentation:

- Slide 41 covered the tradeoffs compared to no build with 1 or 2 auxiliary lanes.
- Slide 42 discussed the benefits of 1 auxiliary lane compared to the 2045 no build.
- Slide 43 discussed the benefits of 2 auxiliary lane compared to the 2045 no build.
- Slide 44 covered the overall comparison between the three options: no build, 1-auxiliary lane, and 2-auxiliary lane.

Commissioner Hardesty: Equity is more than increasing modal options; equity is also about ensuring that we are not exacerbating costs for low-income community members. She suggested expanding the equity definition. Ryan noted that he would pass this request onto the equity team.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC): He began by saying thank you and expressed his trust in the data. Speaking to what Secretary Millar stated earlier, these are all tools. The forecasts are very prescribed methodologies to estimate the future, but it is not an absolute prediction of the future. They are all relative to each other. The last slide of the presentation was a strong overview of the tradeoffs. It shows that the 2-auxiliary lane uncorks that northbound traffic in a very profound way, but that is only for that sort of element of this discussion which is traffic performance and the associated components.

He added that we can't solve all the problems when you build and rebuild infrastructure within a built urban environment; the question is how much can you improve? The aspiration for the RTC is, can we improve things - safety, mobility, etc.? The second is the growth management plans to support a prosperous economy and have a vibrant region. The two international ports are unique attributes, and when they dovetail the economy, they bring jobs into the region. He asked to possibly look at a value trade-off exercise, looking at optimizing the outcomes for the port facilities. Further optimization is needed for the central business district in downtown Vancouver and the historic reserve where Native Americans have been trading for hundreds of years. We should recognize the values of these places.

Secretary Millar: He believes that the modeling tool give them a data point that they can use in their decision-making but understands that models in the long run can end up being wrong, particularly the further out you go in time. This model is looking from today to 25 years from now. He requested that as the program moves into the NEPA phase, he would like to see the model output in increments at five and ten years after construction.

Commissioner Hardesty: Voiced her appreciation to Secretary Millar's last statement. She also requested information on how things will happen during construction and with the introduction of a cost where it was once free; how this will change behavior and is not sure this kind of cost analysis has been done yet. She feels that these types of changes in behavior should be part of the projections that are taking place. This is not just an economic engine it is also about the people.

IBR TRANSIT INVESTMENT CONSIDERATIONS

John Willis, Program Project Manager, presented the next slide deck. He noted that they were going to go through information quickly to ensure everyone is able to hear and ask questions. He was supported by CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) and General Manager Sam Desue (TriMet).

April 21, 2022

- Slide 47 provided a brief overview of the IBR transit investment which included a quick recap of the process to date.
- Slide 48 covered what has changed for transit since 2013.
- Slide 49 provided an overview of the development of representative transit investments.

Program Administrator, Greg Johnson, was able to join the call. He echoed the comments from the other partners. This has been a tremendous effort and the teamwork with the partners staff and the program has been great.

Draft Findings for Transit Measures and Considerations for Representative Transit Investments

- Slide 51-52 outlined the transit measures and draft findings.
- Slide 54 looked at the three transit components to be included in the LPA and what will be studied further in the NEPA phase.

Discussion of Mode/Alignment/Terminus

- Slide 56-58 provided an overview of the three transit mode considerations for the program investment.
 - John noted that the bus on shoulder option was considered as both a stand-alone option but also as an additive to the LRT or BRT.
- Slide 59 looked at 2045 average weekly ridership by mode.
- Slide 60 gave the transit mode takeaways.
- Slide 61 provided a summary of the preferred transit investment mode which is LRT.
- Slide 63 showed the two representative alignment options that were considered.
- Slide 64 looked at the alignment takeaways.
- Slide 65 covered how the program supports Vancouver land use and development goals.
- Slide 66 expressed that the I-5 running/adjacent was the recommended general alignment.
- Slide 69 covered the terminus considerations.
- Slide 70 gave an overview of the preferred transit investment reflecting mode/alignment/terminus.
- Slide 71 gave the next steps the program will be taking.

John asked if the transit partners had anything they wanted to add. CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) wanted to say they have worked very diligently at C-TRAN to improve the future of transportation in SW Washington,

specifically after the stoppage of the CRC project. Their 2030 plan has focused energy on providing frequent, equitable transportations for all members in their community. In addition to all of their recent improvements, they have also introduced the micro transit service which has changed the way for members to connect within their own communities or to the larger C-TRAN network, ensuring that everyone has access to multiple choices that are specific to their travel needs.

The IBR project has provided C-TRAN with a unique opportunity to better connect the transit networks between C-TRAN and TriMet. He added that they have had some recent meetings with extremely forward discussion about recognition of things that changed for both transit systems over the past 10 years and how to incorporate these changes into the current program. He noted that C-TRAN agrees with the I-5 alignment along with the Evergreen terminus which provides the greatest opportunity to connect their modes. The goal here is to minimize displacement or avoid distribution of an already vibrant city streetscape in downtown Vancouver and provide continued access and equity through C-TRAN's current and future network.

With their partners at the City of Vancouver, they feel that this point will also serve demand for future development and help with climate and equity goals. He ended with C-TRAN's agreement to sustain their direct express bus service and extensive BRT framework, which has been successful for both SW Washington and Portland. C-TRAN will have already finalized and constructed their 2030 vision for BRT network.

Steve Witter (TriMet) followed by providing comments from Sam Desue as he need to leave the call for another engagement. Sam wanted to thank all staff on this project at all levels for their hard work. He also thanked to the IBR team for the extensive technical work and robust community engagement. He wanted to acknowledge the strong relationship between TriMet and C-TRAN and their ability to look at the two networks holistically by providing safe, easy, and reliable quick trips for their customers across the river.

TriMet supports the light rail recommendation to Evergreen via I-5. Modeling shows that there is high transit demand and light rail has the capacity to move more people more efficiently and will require customers to make fewer transfers. The I-5 alignment is supported as it provides a safer and more reliable service with fewer impacts and duplication of the Vine service. Extending to Evergreen serves important equity priority areas. Connecting these two systems contributes to the equity and climate goals across the region. TriMet recognizes that the LPA is just the beginning and when addressing the demand in the corridor, TriMet and C-TRAN will continue future partnerships and will explore expansions that can meet the growing demand. TriMet feels the IBR program is heading in the right direction and is eager to partner on addressing the region's climate and equity goals with the completion of this project.

President Peterson added, "It feels great to get to this point in the conversation and appreciates the partnership between TriMet and C-TRAN."

Mayor Anne McEnergy-Ogle (City of Vancouver): Voiced her excitement about the IBR program's direction for transit and it supports her community's future plans for growth and development.

Options Analysis and Review: Modified Locally Preferred Alternative Scenarios

John Willis began his presentation with, how do we tell the story of the entire program and the holistic options that going to be shared.

- Slide 73 provided a brief scenario development overview since past studies/findings from 2013.
- Slide 74 discussed the scenario development. All scenarios will include a new bridge, transit, HI/MD options (change since 2013, auxiliary lane options, and system and demand management.
 - When looking at the scenario on the left with zero auxiliary lanes and no interchange at HI/MD that this did not meet the purpose and need and then on the other end of the scenarios, looking at three auxiliary lanes, climate impacts, and the overall footprint of the program that this was not a viable option for the region.
- Slide 75 shows the two scenario options that they would like to dive deeper into at the May 5th meeting.

President Peterson: Thanked the program for the scenarios. The program has been great to work with on how they look at all the elements and how they the balance with the purpose and need, balance of need for more connections to our desired outcomes for racial equity and climate change. Everyone involved knew from the beginning it would be a project that would have to achieve multiple outcomes. So being able to see all these options is important. At this point seeing these two scenario options, looking at the trade-offs and benefits and the information is going to be really important to the Metro Council. President Peterson noted that she did not want to weight in too early, but Scenario A seems closest to what the Metro Council has been asking for in terms of outcome.

PUBLIC COMMENT

[1:55:10] Karen Gibson: Appreciated the overview. In terms of speaking with stakeholders and community members, there is a small group of us who live right here at the Fourth Plain Interchange directly across the street is I-5. What is this doing to our property values, what is this doing to equity in terms of climate change, what are all of these doing to the small community right here that is sitting right here and not being involved in any of this discussion whatsoever? I do not believe any of you live on our street, so I am curious as to what you are doing to address this. In the previous 2013 project, you had a real estate acquisition plan; how does that fold into what we were doing based up on the auxiliary lanes? How is that going to affect our house, where we live? How does it affect our decisions moving forward? How does it affect our property values? How

does it affect decision making about whether or not we make improvements on our home? What is happening with all of that? Thank you

[1:56:31] Dave Rowe: Commuter from Battle Ground to Lake Oswego. Offshore ocean windmills may be manufactured in Vancouver, such large structures must have more room than the 116-foot clearance than what the IBR is proposing fixed bridge will have. Large structures are built at Thompsons Metal Fab and Oregon Ironworks, building this mega bridge to remove one stoplight on I-5 is a waste of taxpayers' money and impacts industries on the Columbia River. In 2008 the Woodrow Wilson drawbridge was built on I-95 to cross the Potomac River. This same type of bridge could be built over the Columbia River for half the cost and would not affect the industries on the Columbia River. Moving the opening on Burlington Northern River Bridge would eliminate 90% of the I-5 bridge lifts.

[1:58:03] Sarah Iannarone, Executive Director with Street Trust: Thank you for your service on this committee. This is a pivotal project, and we all agree that we need to get it right. I'm stopping by today as a founding partner to briefly introduce you to the Just Crossing Alliance in which community groups from Oregon and Washington have come together to make sure the Interstate Bridge Replacement Project has a positive impact on our regions' climate outcomes, advances to environmental, racial, and economic equity and does not adversely impact the finances of either states' transportation system. To date over 15 organizations from both sides of the river have signed onto our alliance and the number grows each day.

We know you don't consider this bridge project Columbia River Crossing as 2.0, and we don't want you to misunderstand and think that we are here to shut this project down, in fact we are here to help and mean that sincerely. We do not want this project to fail the way CRC did for lack of community support. With this infrastructure investment, our communities are poised for a once-in-a-generation opportunity to create robust transit and active transportation connections across the Columbia River. Our primary concern is ensuring the decisions you make here don't further disadvantage communities in Washington and Oregon who are already paying the highest costs for our failure to transition from auto and fossil fuel dependence.

The Just Crossing Alliance will be organizing in our communities to ensure that Oregonians and Washingtonians' voices are reflected in your decision making. In addition to uplifting the community, we will advocate for the natural environment, fish and wildlife and habitats that have existed here for a millennium.

The Just Crossing Alliance will be working alongside you to ensure that any equity, environmental, and climate gains from our investments are not erased by a big jump in passenger vehicle traffic created by the bridge project. We have enlisted transportation experts who will support you by paying attention to the details: number of lanes, interchanges, pedestrian access, and public transportation for the IBR project and so forth. We need a bi-state solution that meets the needs of our diverse communities on both sides of the river with environmental justice and creates a safe and livable future. We've posted our full value statement at

www.justcrossing.org we encourage you to visit our website and review them along with the quickly growing list of endorsers. Thank you very much and thank you for your work.

[2:44:00] Jordan Lewis: I use to live in Vancouver and had to move to Portland actually because it was so hard to get across the river to other places, I wanted to go without having to rely on having a car or access to a car. I would like to keep this short and want to say I really stress that we need to reconsider adding additional lanes and even auxiliary lanes, if at all possible.

[2:01:52] Karen Gibson: (Previous commentor) asked a very important questions and I would like to know who's representing us? Who do we go to to discuss the situation that's going on right now? It's not like we are objecting to anything about the bridge, but this has a real impact on our life. Now. Future. Do I have to disclose this that's going on if I were to try and sell my house. This has a real impact and I don't see anybody here, Mayor Anne or anybody.

Brent requested that Kim bring up the public comment slides so that Karen has access to that and asked that she follow up with info@interstatebridge.org for an email and the program can follow up her.

CONFIRM UPCOMING MEETING TOPICS, NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

May 5, 2022 is the next meeting where they will introduce the program recommendation for the modified LPA.

Final comments from the Greg Johnson, May 5th for the ESG and bi-state legislation will be the refining of the two scenarios and narrow down to one recommended LPA. We are coming up on a very important time and the team will be busy addressing any questions that come up.

MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mrgam9W-qv8>

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/esg-april-21-2022-meeting/>