

EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP (ESG) MEETING

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

July 21, 2022 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

ESG Members in Attendance: Director Kris Strickler (ODOT), Deputy Secretary Amy Scarton (WSDOT) (alternate), President Lynn Peterson (Metro), State Affairs Manager Ivo Trummer (Port of Portland) (alternate), Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City 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

ESG Members not in Attendance: UMO Director Brendan Finn (ODOT)(alternate), Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT), Executive Director Curtis Robinhold (Port of Portland)

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

WELCOME, INTRODUCTION, PROPOSED AGENDA AND UPDATES

Millicent Williams, Lead Facilitator, opened the meeting by introducing Amanda Owings, Co-Lead Facilitator, who reviewed the meeting ground rules and introduced the partners and/or their alternates.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

[6:59] Zach Lindahl, Washington County Chamber of Commerce: We are a business organization of more than 820 member businesses throughout the region employing over 75,000 people. We have a robust public policy division that advocates on many different business issues including regional transportation. Back in May the IBR team released new details on the status of the I-5 bridge when they unveiled the new Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The LPA detailed that I-5 bridge that would maintain six lanes with an additional auxiliary lane in each direction, an interchanged over Hayden Island, and light rail expansion.

Currently, our century-old bridge faces both safety and congestion-related issues. Its not a question of it, but whether a question of when a serious earthquake could cause a collapse of the bridge. Time is of the essence and it is imperative that a new bridge is built to give us peace of mind that our critical part of our transportation grid is secure. However, building a safer bridge with similar capacity only solves half the

problem. The existing bridge serves 140,000 vehicles daily resulting in heavy traffic for at least seven but up to ten hours a day.

By 2040 the number of crossings is predicted to climb as high as 175,000 vehicles trips daily. The effects of congestion are felt numerous ways as there's an increase of GHG emissions from idling vehicles, reduces free time for commuters, and increase in financial costs associated with the delay of delivery of goods. At this point the proposed solutions for congestion offered by the IBR appears to be a bridge with improved bicycle, pedestrian, and transit options. While this multimodal approach is important and provides commuters additional options, it is in our opinion that it will only result in minor relief for congestion problems. These options are a viable solution for those who are taking short commutes to Portland, but not for all and for freight.

To sum up my testimony, we are here advocating for an increase of capacity in more lanes to help ease congestion on one of our most vital parts of our transportation infrastructure, thank you.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR UPDATES

Program Administrator Greg Johnson provided an update on how the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) fit together (Slide 14-19).

He began by expressing the program's in-depth outreach with the community members on both sides of the river, the partners, and the Community Advisory Group (CAG)/Equity Advisory Group (EAG). The agreed upon LPA identifies the foundational elements that will be studied in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) phase to ensure we are meeting the goals that the Executive Steering Group (ESG) has set for us, and that the community expects of us.

Administrator Johnson reminded the audience of the specific elements that are within the recommended modified LPA (slides 15 and 16) along with other assumptions (slide 17). He noted that early on in the process, the program went through the studies of crossing alternatives, such as a tunnel, but that option was removed as it does not meet the purpose and need of the project nor the desires of the partners to connect interchanges through this corridor.

Program Administrator Greg Johnson was happy to announce that the program had unanimous endorsement from the eight partners on the modified LPA. (Slide 18) He added that throughout this process they have received many letters in support of the program and some that have been critical of where the program stands today. The program is taking each comment very seriously and working to address each one in the next phase.

Program Administrator Greg Johnson reviewed slide 19 which covered the program commitments that have been identified with the program partners.

EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP MEMBER UPDATES

During this part of the meeting, each partner was given an opportunity to provide comments on what is going on within their jurisdictions and to also speak to the program process to date. Each partner noted their appreciation to the IBR program and all the efforts made to arrive at this point. A big thank you went out to Program Administrator Greg Johnson for his hard and very transparent work with the partners. They noted that this time around, they felt heard and their concerns were addressed. Others took this time to acknowledge and express their gratitude to all of the community participation.

Many partners noted that their boards and councils were supportive of moving forward with the program. Before moving on Millicent asked that the two CAG co-chairs, Lynn Valenter and Ed Washington, provide any final comments. Lynn added that this is a bi-state venture and the CAG came together with joint goals and a joint conversation. The CAG is also looking forward to moving into the next phase of this process and is really looking forward to seeing the designs evolve and being a part of influencing the outcome.

PARTNER RECOMMENDATIONS

Each partner was asked the following question:

Do you, Partner, recommend to move the Modified Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) into the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) process for further evaluation?

Director Kris Strickler (ODOT) – Yes

Deputy Secretary Amy Scarton (WSDOT)(alternate) – Yes

President Lynn Peterson (Metro) – Yes

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) – Yes

CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Vancouver) – Yes

State Affairs Manager Ivo Trummer (Port of Portland)(alternate) – Yes

General Manager Sam Desue (TriMet) – Yes

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) – Yes

Director Matt Ransom (RTC) – Yes

Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle (City of Vancouver) – Yes

Next, Ms. Williams proposed a similar but different question to the CAG co-chairs:

Do you believe the community advisory groups (CAG) have had the opportunity to provide input on the components of the modified LPA and to assess how these components compare to the CAGs values and priorities? Based on the CAGs input, are you comfortable supporting the program's recommendation to advance the modified LPA for analysis as part of the environmental process?

CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter – Yes

CAG Co-Chair Ed Washington – Yes

Facilitator Williams took a moment to celebrate this milestone and thanked everyone for their commitment to the program. She then handed the floor over to Program Administrator Greg Johnson who took this time to thank the ESG and their staff. He then reviewed slide 23 which provided a high overview of the next steps. He noted that this afternoon, the program will be speaking with the bi-state legislative committee to receive acknowledgement of the work that has been completed to date and confirm that the program has regional alignment.

Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle voiced the importance of finance plan as the assumption has been that it will be 1/3 from the states, 1/3 from federal, and 1/3 from tolling. She noted that this would assume that the program would be requesting \$2 billion from the federal government and asked for assurance be indicated in the finance plan. Program Administrator Greg Johnson noted that the program is going to be asking for \$2.5 billion. He added that the program recently had a conversation with the USDOT in regards to submitting an application for the Big Bridge Grant Program, which will include a request for \$700 million. In addition, the program is working on the application for the Mega Grant in 2024 for a similar amount and applying for the Capital Investment Grant Program with the Federal Transit Agency.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty asked if this money is guaranteed regardless of who is in office. Program Administrator Greg Johnson stated that there are no guarantees and stressed the importance of moving forward with the commitments as quickly as possible.

Mayor Anne McEnery-Ogle followed by acknowledging that there are competing projects in Portland, for example the Burnside Bridge. Why would ODOT and WSDOT not go for more funding upfront early. Program Administrator Greg Johnson noted that he can only speak for the IBR program and reiterated that we are seeking a larger request. They are restricted to grant requests for the bridge program of half the cost of the bridge and right now the program anticipates the bridge costing \$1.5 billion. The program is asking for the maximum amount allowable.

Program Administrator Greg Johnson continued to review next steps and stated that the program will be looking at other federal funding opportunities. CEO Shawn Donaghy requested clarification, the estimated cost of the construction for the bridge was \$1.5 billion seems low for a \$5 billion project. Program Administrator Greg Johnson clarified that the \$1.5 billion is just for the bridge itself and not the five-mile corridor.

Program Administrator Greg Johnson moved on to state that the current design is at 2-3% and in 2024 the program will be advancing design. They will be putting more effort into the design elements for the bridge type and layout for the stacked or side-by-side alignment. The program will also be responding to the Coast Guard's question regarding a movable bridge option that could result in construction of the largest movable bridge in the world. The program will continue to provide public outreach to bring the community along with the design. The project is anticipated to remain on schedule with ground-breaking in late 2025/early 2026.

CAG Co-Chair Ed Washington took a moment to thank Program Administrator Greg Johnson and the program staff for giving the CAG respect and appreciation. He replicated the appreciation for both the CAG members themselves and the co-chairs.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty brought to attention that Program Administrator Greg Johnson announced that Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle and herself were going to be co-chairing the Community Benefits Workforce Agreement Committee and she clarified that at this time she has not committed to this but would like to encourage the program and the partners to have a meeting to outline the expectations and make a plan moving forward. Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty added that they are both interested and acknowledge the importance. Program Administrator Greg Johnson noted that the program is putting together a framework plan for what this committee roles and responsibilities will be.

Director Matt Ransom wanted to reinforce the comments heard from Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle in relation to the finance plan. He requested that the program do a good job at explaining how the funding works and specifically for the public to understand and get behind strategy.

Program Administrator Greg Johnson provided a brief overview the program schedule looking forward (slide 24). In closing, Administrator Johnson wanted to thank the program team for their dedication and getting everyone to this point in the process.

CONFIRM UPCOMING MEETING TOPICS, NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

Millicent thanked the ESG for their time and noted that there will not be an ESG meeting next month but will reconvene in September. There will still be movement with the program and updates will be provided.

July 21, 2022

The meeting adjourned at 11:38 am.

MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8lahTfchSul>

The meeting materials are available here:

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