

EXECUTIVE STEERING GROUP (ESG) MEETING

HIGH-LEVEL MEETING SUMMARY

March 17, 2022, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

ESG Members in Attendance: Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT), UMO Director Brendan Finn (ODOT) (alternate), President Lynn Peterson (Metro), Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland), Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver), CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Vancouver), Executive Director Curtis Robinhold (Port of Portland), Director of Engineering and Construction Steve Witter (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: Commissioner Jack Burkman (Port of Vancouver, alternate), Director Kris Strickler (ODOT), Councilor Mary Nolan (Metro Councilor, alternate)

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

WELCOME, INTRODUCTION, PROPOSED AGENDA AND UPDATES

Millicent Williams, Lead Facilitator, welcomed the group and noted that the meeting recording had started. Millicent wished everyone a Happy St. Patrick's Day and reviewed the agenda prior to handing the floor over to the ESG members for opening comments.

Greg Johnson, Program Administrator, was asked to provide opening comments prior to hearing from the ESG members. He began by noting how hard the team has been working towards making a recommendation to the ESG. He also welcomed Executive Director Curtis Robinhold representing the Port of Portland who is assuming the role in the place of Chief Public Affairs Officer Kristen Leonard.

Introductions of each member with comments followed:

CAG Co-Chair Lynn Valenter – CAG has been meeting twice a month and there is a sense of excitement among them.

CAG Co-Chair Ed Washington – stated that the CAG is working hard, and they are still very interested and, at the end of the day, they want a bridge built.

CEO Julianna Marler (Port of Portland) – Last Tuesday was another freight leadership meeting where they voiced appreciation towards the program with their input and data. She has been participating in the Pacific NW Waterway and they all seem to be excited and shared their support for the program.

Executive Director, Curtis Robinhold (Port of Portland) – Noted to the ESG that he is very committed to a new bridge and looks forward to making an LPA recommendation.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC) – commended the great work of the freight leadership group in recognizing our region as an international gateway and the value of moving big things forward.

CEO Shawn Donaghy (C-TRAN) – noted the hard deadlines coming up and appreciated the helpful conversations with agencies on both sides of the river. He did request more information on the climate element and would also like to look at displacement impacts as this has not been discussed to date.

Director of Engineering and Construction Steve Witter (TriMet) – noted that this will be his second to last meeting representing TriMet as he is retiring in May.

Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver) – voiced her excitement towards the financial \$1 billion from Washington State Legislature.

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty (City of Portland) – noted she is a little nervous about a rush to the finish line and feels like there are still a lot of details that still need to be provided that will need to be shared with her Council. She wants to be sure she is bringing her colleagues along to make this big decision. She added that she will be driven by the data and not a timeline.

Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT) – WSDOT feels they have the federal and state packages, and it is time to deliver. He would like to make sure what is delivered is a shovel-worthy investment. He agrees with Hardesty that we need the details to get to the finish line; should be schedule informed and not driven.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR UPDATE

Greg Johnson acknowledged the good work by Steve Witter, and he will be missed.

Tolling Administration Overview – Ray Mabey (Assistant Program Administrator)

Projects of this size require all sorts of funding, including state funds, federal grants from FTA and USDOT, but user fees in the form of tolls rounds out the program funding. One of the first decisions is who should administer the toll on the bridge. The program sat down with both Oregon and Washington DOTs who focused on the customer experience and the setting up the system. Between the two governments, it was decided that ODOT will be administering the tolls (slides 11-12 of the presentation). A memorandum of understanding was signed that identifies the toll administrator; it does not include toll rates or how collected funds will be spent or shared among the states. Mr. Mabey shared that there are a number of commitments that will be identified in further bi-state agreements.

President Lynn Peterson (Metro) – noted that she was a little surprised but would have appreciated updates with pros and cons on how this was decided. Ms. Peterson requested a list of things for which the toll money would be used. She requested clarification from the program about the community benefits work.

Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle (City of Vancouver)– stated that it is essential that every word you use in this presentation is carefully stated so that public understands what the tolls are paying for, emphasizing that the toll will not cover additional projects in Portland.

Secretary Roger Millar (WSDOT) – provided clarification that the commissions in Portland and Vancouver operate in different ways. The use of the money is restricted by both states’ constitutions.

Commissioner Hardesty shared President Peterson’s concern, asking if there is any analysis completed regarding best practices around tolling. She is concerned that a major decision was made and that the elected officials in the region have no impact on if tolling is the only option for paying back freeway construction.

Ray Mabey offered to meet with Commissioner Hardesty to share the details on how they got to this decision. There were many factors that went into this, and tolling is key factor that goes into the funding package for the program. It could be either agency, but Oregon was best suited to administer the toll. Commissioner Hardesty would appreciate the additional time, adding that she feels strongly that the status quo (regarding major transportation projects) has never worked, especially for those of color.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC) opined that there is a great public interest on this topic. The program needs to be clear with the process flow, including how this committee flows within this process.

Secretary Millar added that we have made one very small decision between the two agencies. The MOU only covers who administers the tolling. No decision about policy have been made at this time. The policy decision will be made in the future. He clarified which office will be implementing the decisions that are made by this committee. In Washington State, nothing gets tolled until the legislature enables that.

President Peterson stated that there is lack of clarity on the future of tolling within the region, including Vancouver. We do not have the financial plans that have been relayed to the ESG and feels they are at a disadvantage in the conversation of understanding why the decision was made. They do not have an understanding of if the benefits and costs were rational for this decision. It feels very out of context at this point because there are no systemwide plans being discussed. She requested a call for clarity on the Oregon side, this is a big red flag that these decisions are being made without any context or discussion and they could add up to become a bigger issue.

Ray Mabey concluded his report by mentioning his appreciation for the comments and noted that the policies on tolling will be discussed and worked through with ESG. He also added that he would be happy to meet with President Peterson as well to discuss how this decision was made.

Washington DC Visit

Administrator Greg Johnson traveled to DC to attend American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) meetings, finding that they are aware of the program, and it is a national priority for economic corridors. They discussed grants and strategies for this program and not to interfere with each state's other programs.

Secretary Millar added it was a successful visit and we have partners at the federal level that are supportive and appreciate the commitment to climate and equity.

Moving Ahead Washington

The program is still waiting on the signature from Governor Inslee but wanted to thank all the Washington partners for their commitment on getting this piece of legislature signed.

Defining the Modified LPA

The program has been working closely with the CAG and EAG and rolling out the processes for the LPA. To explain how these groups will inform the decision, Administrator Johnson outlined the following roadmap for the information points being used for making a program recommendation:

- performing data analyses through various scenarios requested from these groups and the partners
- collected surveys from the public
- gathering info from technical working groups on different elements
- taking advice and input from the CAG and EAG
- using screening criteria results identified in collaboration with agency partners

All of this will inform the program to make a recommendation to the ESG in late April. Once the ESG has reviewed the recommendation, they can take this to their boards and commissions. Once the program receives the ESG endorsement, it will go to the bi-state legislative group.

LPA DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

John Willis, Project Manager, began the conversation about the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) process (Slide 14) which covered the activities that are going to get the program to the modified LPA and eventually the July endorsement. He noted that today, the ESG will be looking at the Hayden Island/Marine Drive and River Crossing /Downtown Vancouver elements. Greg Johnson added that when they refer to "we" it is not just the IBR program but also includes the staff working members from each of the agencies who are reviewing data to help make this recommendation.

When we get to May, we will have the modified LPA in front of the boards and councils and the endorsement from this group in late June or early July.

John reviewed what has changed since the Record of Decision in 2013 (Slide 15) and the steps to get to the modified LPA was covered in Slide 16. He noted the key components include transit mode, transit alignment, possibly a terminus, interchanges on Hayden Island and Marine Drive, replacement of the North Portland Harbor Bridge, and active transportation improvements. The modified LPA recommendation includes technical expert review of data, partner agency feedback, screening results such as for transit investments, traffic data, the equity analysis and input from partners, EAG, and CAG.

Katy Belokonny from the Government Relations team noted at the end of April you can expect to see the program's recommended LPA become public and come before the CAG and EAG at those meetings. At this point, the eight program partners will review and discussing the recommended LPA with their various boards and councils. South of the river, specifically with the City of Portland and Metro, there will be additional advisory committee/commission meetings that will consider the elements of the LPA during this time frame. The program partners' boards or councils will have one to two meetings to become familiar with the recommended modified LPA and then a meeting to endorse that recommendation. This process will take place from early to mid-May through early to mid-July.

After that, the team anticipates ESG will consider making a 'consensus recommendation' collectively in July after the respective governing bodies have done the same individually. Lastly, we propose that the bi-state legislative committee consider endorsing the modified LPA at a late July meeting.

This has been the program's plan and timeline for the last several months and has become even more clear as a pathway with the Washington supplemental transportation budget specifically calling out language requiring the program to deliver a report to the Washington legislature by August 1st that includes the LPA.

John then discussed the items following the LPA endorsement. One is to signal to both our state legislatures that there is an LPA. Another is to get a definition to take into the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). That definition needs to reflect the changes since the 2013 decision; entering the NEPA process signifies the start of further in-depth analysis and evaluation of the IBR program. There will be opportunities during the SEIS to gather additional details and recommendations on the overall bridge design; look at how impacts are clearly mitigated; and gather deeper community engagement. This will start in July and August, 2022.

Commissioner Hardesty acknowledged that this is an extremely tight timeline and hopes there is flexibility as getting this through boards and councils could be challenging; two meetings until a decision is needed feels unrealistic. Administrator Johnson indicated that the program will make themselves available whether it is individual meetings or group sessions. She noted that her colleagues are tied up in budget review right now and will be less available through the end of May. Steve Witter from TriMet noted that Commissioner Hardesty carried his concern. Agency staff will work very hard, but the availability of leadership is unpredictable.

President Peterson echoed what others said. The concern is that there will not be enough time to consider and review all of the variables. Also, the fact that there might only be one recommendation and how that is going to meet all three realms of decision-making: political, technical, and financial. Her concern is if they are

just going to get one recommendation based on a series of assumptions and that it is not going to actually allow ESG members to see how the components of transit, variable rate tolling, number of lanes, and all the narrowing that still needs to occur and how the different scenarios can play out in different ways. For the record, President Peterson is concerned about having one staff recommendation. She would rather see three scenarios that meet different objectives and then have a conversation about how to narrow it down to a staff recommendation.

Greg Johnson noted that they are currently working on the narrowing down with staff members from each of the agencies. They have been running the scenarios that were requested by the partners and looking at all the elements. President Peterson clarified that she would want to see how those integrate depending on the assumptions. Greg assured the ESG that the program is looking at the project holistically. Greg added that taking multiple options forward greatly complicates the next steps of the process. He noted that program can take the advice of this body if there is a desire to see something different than what is projected; we will take that advice. The program is just making the recommendation and this ESG is going to give us direction as to whether it is accepted or not.

Director Matt Ransom (RTC) noted that there are a lot of constituents around the table and recognizes the efforts the program has made to reach out to each and every one. He questioned the milestone in July and sought clarification; building off what Secretary Millar said, is that right now we are looking at the big building blocks that the program is putting in place to get into the NEPA starting gates. The program will have to publish the formal notice of intent in the federal register. We still must convene the federal and partner agencies to start the technical review of all the aspects of the project. He feels it would be helpful to understand if there are opportunities within the NEPA process to change or pivot if the impacts are too great in one area and how those building blocks can they evolve between July and the final environmental impact statement. He thinks it is important to have a simple understanding that they can explain within the community and help navigate policy boards with some clarity around this topic.

Greg Johnson agreed and will commit to this request and explained that SEIS process through NEPA is a very public process that will look at impacts and these are things that the program will be refining toward a preliminary design after they have received an amended record of decision. If there is a need to pivot after the July decision, that is part of the NEPA process.

Secretary Millar provided clarification that the decision that the ESG is being asked to make this summer is not an alternative to *build*, it is an alternative to *test* through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The alternative may evolve through the NEPA process given more public input, more policy-maker input, and more data, making sure the concerns and impacts are tested and mitigated. This spring is a staff recommendation based on the data and analysis, what we are asking for the ESG to buy into a concept.

Millar continued, asking that ESG members bring forward their concerns so that the program can build those concerns in the NEPA process. Through NEPA, the program will have the opportunity to see where the different elements interact, if they are integrating well, and identify mitigations or solutions. He does not want to minimize the ESG decision, but the program needs to do a better job explaining what the decision is and

the opportunities to modify, change, to make the decision better. There will be a time when the program asks for comment on a final, build solution for construction. That is not the question we are asking this summer.

Greg Johnson thanked Secretary Millar for his clarification.

President Peterson – wants to be extremely clear. What she is hearing that the different combination of elements will be discussed at a staff level and then a staff recommendation will be made and if this is the direction, we are going to have a big problem because we need to have a transparent accountable process in which there a several different combinations of things discussed and the pros and cons and whether they meet purpose and need, community benefits agreements, the racial equity goals, the greenhouse gas emissions. She feels it can't be just one. If it is just one, it could lead to the failure.

Administrator Johnson suggested a more in-depth conversation about what this body is expecting to see in the April meeting. The Administrator will engage with the team and ESG members and make sure the program is doing all that is being asked.

Commissioner Hardesty voiced appreciation for Secretary Millar's explanation, but would like to see documentation. She does not delegate decision making to her staff, and it does feel like she is getting the opportunity to make a decision when they are looking at twenty options and she is only getting one. She agrees with Peterson, she would like to see what options are rejected. This does not need to be a long document; it could be a one pager that explains why. She does not want the team to do extensive work.

Administrator Johnson clarified that the program is asking the ESG to reflect on the work completed thus far and the program's effort to create a concept or "box" that takes into account all partner concerns, possible scenarios requested, and considers data results. The next phase is where the program is going to start clarifying what that box looks like, what the impacts are and whether things have to change inside of the box.

Commissioner Hardesty followed that it would be helpful if the ESG was getting this information as they move along instead of one week prior to them having to make a decision. She wants to help bring them along so that they can give a unanimous vote and she can't do that if she does not have the information as to how we got to where we are.

The facilitator indicated that, in order to get to and through presentations the ESG should discontinue conversation on the current item and move on to the next presentation. John Willis added that they will present the various combinations in a future meeting, per Peterson's request.

A seven-minute break was given and upon returning, Facilitator Williams noted that the Climate presentation will not be presented today but will be at the top of the agenda at next month's meeting. She thanked Mara for all of her efforts but felt that the adjustment to the agenda will allow for a meaningful conversation.

REVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE TRANSIT INVESTMENTS

John Willis began his presentation of the overview of the different transit options, consisting of 11 build options and one no-build option (Slide 21). He noted since the last time the ESG had seen this, two options were added. Option L represents a terminus near McLoughlin/I-5 with a waterfront station and Option M represents a terminus near Evergreen/I-5 with a waterfront station. These were analyzed with staff from both MPOs.

John then covered how transit investments are measured (Slide 22). The IBR team developed 16 measures with project partners in order to better understand how the investments would perform relative to each other. John did clarify that they did look at high-level potential impacts; he requested that today's group should focus on high-level impacts to help us understand which options we do take in the next phase and conduct deeper testing analysis.

John moved onto Slide 23 which covered the changes since 2013 for transit, highlighting transit upgrades and population growth on the north side of the river. Though changes impact context and operations in transit on both sides of the river, these elements really influenced the transit evaluation.

Draft Transit Findings

John reviewed slides 25-26 that provided brief overview of what the IBR program has learned through their transit analysis.

Commissioner Hardesty – Requested that John speak more towards the park and rides as she feels they are underutilized in the Portland area. John clarified that that Park and rides are part of the consideration of how you'll get riders to transit. What we have learned does relate to park and rides and is covered on an upcoming slide. What the program was recognizing is that transferring from other transit vehicles is important? instead of park and rides.

Hardesty agreed with John and noted that she feels we lose space with park and rides on her side of the river. John agreed that if you can build a strong transit system with park and rides it would be a huge success. Park and rides are a good way to drive ridership which the team will be happy to discuss in great detail. He also noted that they may not be the right solution in every area.

John concluded that if ESG members want to look at the full 16 measures, their staff have the information and can go into deeper detail individually.

Next Steps

Millicent added the slides that were shared with the CAG and EAG were made available to the ESG on Monday of this week. We wanted to make sure that we reflected that the program listened to what was requested in the last ESG meeting and did a higher-level overview of the information that the team wanted to share.

Commissioner Hardesty wanted to revisit the park and ride discussion. She thinks about housing people and their ability to afford it? She requested that the program keep this topic in their minds moving forward. Her concern is that this region is becoming so unaffordable for many working people. She added that if the program has an opportunity to add housing that people can afford to live and not only focus on the bridge and connecting the two.

Shawn Donaghy – C-TRAN’s position is to protect downtown Vancouver and SW Washington with limited amount of park and rides on the peripheral. From a transit perspective, C-TRAN understands the benefits of park and rides, but also sees benefits in quality public transit transfer opportunities given the enhanced transit network that exists today. One thing the transit agencies see is gravitation away from park and rides within downtown corridors. As a transit representative of SW Washington, they have a responsibility to be carried over as well. He and his team definitely had concerns when they saw some of the models that existed that took dedicated space away from community colleges or potential displacement of houses. He feels that as they start to narrow down the options, everyone will see transit pick out an area they believe is the best location to provide good public transit transfers and really holds down any displacement and also discourages potential gentrification in the future as a function of the public projects.

Rebecca Kennedy, City of Vancouver – Continuing the conversation opened by Commissioner Hardesty, she highlighted the equitable transit investment strategy the city and C-TRAN have been working on for several years. When they look at making transit investments, they need to ask themselves, “how can we connect people who need it [transit] to essential places and spaces where they need to get?” and “how can we do this in a way that adds benefit or does not create additional burden?” The city has a very clearly defined strategy around affordable housing, workforce access, small business assistance, and considers residential and commercial displacement. These are critical things to look at in terms of long-term equitable transit investment rather than who might be able to reach future jobs. The program needs to think very clearly about how they can keep the people who are here now, here in 2045 and further so they can benefit from the investment.

Steve Witter, TriMet – This conversation shows we are talking about a different way of doing these large-scale transit improvements and is happy to say that they have learned something new along the way. He commends the work by the city and C-TRAN and that they have been ahead of this and are now waiting to have a quality response that enhances the livability of their community and does not create traffic somewhere else. He feels that building more park and rides can encourage more congestion in places that really can’t take the additional burden. It is also a bigger burden on the affordability of people accessing jobs and having to manage jobs and maintain automobiles.

Brendan Finn, ODOT Urban Mobility Director – In response to Commissioner Hardesty, there is a good example/model if you look at Interstate light rail and specifically the Skidmore station. The city partnered with TriMet and the Portland Housing Bureau to incorporate affordable housing in conjunction with transit improvements.

Secretary Millar commented that the time for park and rides and come and gone. A park and ride at the end of the line is one thing, but the team at C-TRAN over the last several years have developed a transit network that serves the region, so the end of the light-rail line is not really the end of the line anymore, it is more of a transfer point. Most people that are going to use the system are going to get there by walking, biking, or by taking the bus. This program needs to design a system based on this. To put a park and ride at the station is going to attract hundreds of cars to that space during the peak hour, which congests the facility, congests the roads around it, and creates a variety of safety concerns. The other thing they are finding is that building structured parking can cost towards of \$200,000 per parking space. The program should reassess the investment in park and rides in exchange for building affordable housing and create transit ridership and create community that way.

John closed the transit discussion, noting that they will come back to this group to talk about winnowing the transit options and how to make the right investments in transit to achieve the desired goals.

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP UPDATE

CAG Co-chairs Lynn Valenter and Ed Washington provided an update on the recent CAG meetings. Ed opened the discussion by covering the CAG's role in the modified LPA process (slide 32). He noted that when you bring this many citizens into the fold, they do not have the time that we have, but they are very interested in being a part of this process and seeing it be successful.

He then handed the floor over to Lynn who began with noting they have had two meetings with the CAG since the last ESG. She noted that they were provided with a significant amount of information at the first meeting, and, at the second meeting, they were able to come back and share their thoughts on all that had been presented. She then provided an overview of the CAG's feedback on transit investments (slide 33).

Lynn reminded the ESG that the CAG really does replicate the community at-large. So, when they survey CAG and the community, the outcomes are startlingly aligned. She moved into slide 34 that covered the CAG values and priorities. Lynn echoed Ed by adding that this group has been remarkably motivated and engaged in processing the information and providing meaningful feedback but also, we are looking for information on specific data from them, for example how long does it take an individual to commute from their home to a job out in Clark County. They have also been sharing their thoughts on how transportation and housing can help elevate our communities.

Commissioner Hardesty thanked Lynn and Ed for their honesty and supported their desire to connect transportation and housing.

Matt Ransom added that the CAG reminds us that we are looking at this from a regional standpoint, not political or geographic boundaries.

Ed Washington ended emphasizing his appreciation to the CAG.

The facilitator p0did a time check and asked the ESG if they would want hear the quick three part technical update from the team or reserve this information for the next meeting. Commissioner Hardesty noted that since many members had to drop off the call for other engagements it might be best to more toward the public comment period and continue this important discussion at the next meeting. She feels that they have the material to review and everyone will be prepared have a robust discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Ortblatt [2:30:41] Washington resident and 40-year civil engineer. He has submitted for this meeting over a dozen comments on why a high bridge is a bad solution and why an immersed tunnel is a preferred solution. Unfortunately, the IBR program has rejected an immersed tunnel based on a misleading assessment. Please study my comments. Please let me read one of the most important comments, an investigation conducted by the Department of Transportation office of inspector general of the IBR's tunnel concept revealed several false claims. This could delay or cancel federal funding from the Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration. I suggest that the IBR retract this misleading report on the immersed tunnel and have an independent engineering firm, competent, review this option. Thank you

John Ley [2:32:31] Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen, John Ley from SW Washington. I am eager to see the data that follow this discussion that there is significant demand for transit. Perspective, as always, is totally appropriate. The Oregon transportation commissioner said that, overall, only 4% of people in Oregon use transit and so in the Portland area we know that is higher than in a macro sense if transit ridership were to double from 5% to 10%, that's significant. However, that doesn't handle the traffic congestion problem and that is overwhelming what the people want. We learned before the pandemic from the penco survey that 94% of the people wanted to use their privately owned vehicles and, therefore, after the pandemic more people used their private vehicles and avoided transit ridership. TriMet said it was going to take six years for their transit ridership to return to the pre-pandemic levels. At the end of the day, we are looking at 400,000 to half a million vehicles on the I-5 corridor. How are we going to accommodate that demand for vehicles and traffic congestion? How can we accommodate that many people on transit? I don't think it is physically possible because light-rail and buses can only carry so many people on a corridor that has three through lanes north and south. So, the people want traffic congestion relief, we would love to see the data on transit ridership and everything you are doing. Thank you so very much.

CONFIRM UPCOMING MEETING TOPICS, NEXT STEPS AND SUMMARY

Millicent Williams concluded the meeting by thanking the public commenters. She thanked everyone provided a brief recap noting that the program heard there is concern about the timeline so the team will work hard to provide you with the information you need to provide a level of comfort as we continue to advance the program. The team will also provide you the additional insights on getting to the LPA and what it means going into the environmental study.

The Program also recognizes more information on the tolling decision is needed. Today, we also heard the conversation on park and rides and will consider moving this forward in the program. At the same time, we will look at how the program moves forward as it relates to affordable housing.

Upcoming ESG meetings will be on April 7th and April 21st. Millicent noted that the agenda for April 7th will change a little bit as some of today's items will be presented at that time. There is also a proposed April 29th meeting, but the invite has not gone out at this time.

Commissioner Hardesty thanked Millicent for her efforts during these meetings. She noted that she would commit to a weekend meeting and also extending the meetings to three hours to be able to reach the timelines the program has proposed.

Greg Johnson thanked everyone and tendered that these conversations are tough, but they are getting the program closer to the deadline. He noted that anytime anyone would like to talk to himself or the team, they will make themselves available. This program wants to be as transparent as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 12:42 p.m.

MEETING RECORD AND MATERIALS

Meeting Recording

A recording of the meeting is available here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S3mggEv84tY&t=2s>

Meeting Materials

The meeting materials are available here:

<https://www.interstatebridge.org/get-involved-folder/calendar/esg-march-17-2022-meeting/>